

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXII.]

APRIL, 1859.

[Vol. XV.

COQUEREL'S CHRISTOLOGY.*

IN analyzing M. Coquerel's account of the successive phases of New-Testament Christology, we have expressed our dissent as to the asserted *degrees* of diversity, and also objected to taking the order in which the books were composed as the order in which Christological ideas were developed. To us, indeed, it appears that there were only two principal *nuances*, or shades of thought, respecting the work and person of the Saviour; the first suggested while his work was going on, the second soon after it was completed. The first was necessarily imperfect, Jewish and narrow,—*Messianic*, if you please, in the Jewish sense of that word. The second is seen rapidly widening into Christian catholicity at the dictate of the great events which, in fact, complete his mission,—namely, the Saviour's own death and resurrection, the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the apostles, and, most of all perhaps, the mission of Peter to the Gentile Cornelius, and the call of the apostle Paul to the same work. We think, moreover, that the shades of opinion and feeling traceable in the apostolic writings have reference to the *work* of Jesus Christ rather than to his *person*. On the former subject there is a very wide difference between the Christology of Peter, James and John in the Gospels, and that of the same men when preaching in the Acts or writing in the Epistles; but on the latter, we cannot think there was much diversity between the belief of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and that of Paul and John. The difference between Peter and Paul, for which the latter "withstood the former to the face" (Gal. ii. 14), we regard as having arisen upon a mere matter of detail, not of principle; for Paul elsewhere avows in his own person the principle of being "as a Jew to the Jews." So that we cannot consent to adopt the now fashionable distinction of a "Paulinian" and a "Petreian" school in the early church.

We have thus far been content to accept without question M. Coquerel's statement of the order in which the books of the New Testament were composed. Nor do we indeed question its general correctness. But we must express our surprise at the date assigned to one book,—the Acts of the Apostles,—

* Continued from p. 173.

which he believes to have been written *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, though it ends with leaving Paul prisoner at Rome ten years before that time, and expresses (according to our author) the same low Messianic Christology as the synoptical Gospels, without a touch of the higher views which Luke would naturally, one would think, have imbibed from St. Paul.

Our author indeed faces this latter objection by declaring that the lower alternations of opinion were purposely expressed by later writers in the full knowledge that the higher ones had been before avowed. His theory is far too ingenious for us; but it is due to him to express it fully in his own words, which some of our readers may perhaps find more convincing than we do:

"From all the preceding remarks it is fair to conclude, that the Christology of St. Paul was possibly known to St. Matthew, very probably to St. Mark, and (what at all events is enough for our position) quite certainly to St. Luke. Well, then, it has been settled, by a comparison of terms easily weighed, that the Christology of the synoptics, without contradicting that of the apostle, differs from it in degree of elevation; it is more messianic and less heavenly; it is more concerned with the Redeemer, less with the *Son*; if therefore it keeps at such a distance from that of St. Paul, this is done through design, purposely and deliberately; if the evangelists do not follow his track and do not add to his vast and profound instructions on the pre-existence, the unique origin, and the delegated creative function of the Son; if they do not anticipate St. John in his assertions, but begin their books so differently; if they agree in declaring that the mysterious nature of Christ is known only to God; if they devote themselves to setting him forth specifically as Saviour, lawgiver and model;—it is because they believed—it is because they knew—that this was enough. I repeat that, without contradicting St. Paul, they do not imitate him nor re-echo what he had said; they do not follow his flight; they thus authorize a timid faith to give up aspiring to their predecessor's heights of genius, and content itself with the stage which has satisfied their own minds. Who shall pretend to say that redemption may not be learnt in the first three Gospels, when the *measure of grace* given (Eph. iv. 7) does not enable its recipient to go farther? The New Testament itself, therefore, furnishes proof that these high doctrines of faith are not necessary, and will not be demanded except from those who can grasp them; and for the consolation and reassurance of those whose belief rests in a more humble sphere, there remains before God, our *righteous Judge*, the resource of believing specifically according to the instruction given by the first three historians of the Saviour.

"Perhaps it may be said, This is admitting two different Christianities. No; it is admitting that *every man shall see the salvation of God* (Luke iii. 6), and that all minds are not alike nor designed by God to be so; it is admitting that the rallying-point of faith, or the saving basis of faith, is not a metaphysical theory, and that every one will have to render account according to what has been given him; such men as St. Paul will be required to give account of a third heaven, since they have been enabled to rise to it; such as St. John, of the pre-existence of Christ, since he alone records the paschal prayer; and the great

crowd who heard Jesus on the mount in Galilee will be answerable for the Sermon on the Mount, because they heard it.

"All this argument would fall to the ground, if St. Paul had remained longer in Arabia, if the evangelists had written before him, or if his principal Epistles had not been disseminated till after the synoptical Gospels. It might then have been said that instruction in the Christian faith properly begins with the Messiahship and limits itself to a mere glimpse of the divinity of Christ; till you pass on to St. Paul, who teaches a more elevated, yet digressive, dogmatic Christology, and finish with St. John, who makes the knowledge of the Son the special subject of his book, and thus puts the crowning stone to the building. Agreed; this progress would have been, humanly speaking, the most regular, the best arranged, the most logical; but *the thoughts of God are not as our thoughts* (Is. lv. 8), and inspired preaching has its *foolishness* (1 Cor. i. 24). The order of revelation is the contrary to this factitious order; the Epistles manifest at once the Saviour and the Son; the synoptic Gospels manifest the Saviour specifically; and after them comes St. John to disclose the Word in the Son."—I. 273—276.

We leave this full explanation of the author's views to speak for itself. Only *we* cannot see that the "order of revelation" is such as described, and *we* feel that when so represented it becomes "factitious" and incredible, at least to our minds. But we heartily accept his conclusion that "it is sufficient to believe with the synoptics." Is he sure, then, that believing what they deliberately and purposely ignored is any addition to our real Christian knowledge? It is confessedly unnecessary to Christian instruction; is it true and clear as a part of Christian doctrine?

We now pass on to notice briefly the second volume, which is devoted to Metaphysical and Moral Christology. The reconciliation of Christian sects by metaphysical Christology is, as we of course expect, pronounced impossible; but in the "moral study of Christology" our author sees a brighter hope. The moral perfection of Christ is the expected point of union, as already seen in prospect by many good men:

"When the disciples of the gospel shall have advanced so far as to say to one another, before every other lesson of religion, 'Christ is the perfect model of humanity,' their discussions can no longer turn upon anything but the metaphysics of religion, its outward forms and the rights of the priesthood; prompt justice will be done upon the sectarian spirit, and the spirit of intolerance and persecution; in truth, these deplorable tendencies will die out of themselves; it is clear that when Christians begin with imitating Christ, they will put theology, casuistry and priestly prerogative in the second rank; they will begin, not with polemics, but with charity and liberty; not with mutual anathemas, but with the duty and happiness of mutual love."—II. 327.

This is the virtual conclusion of the whole matter. As the first division of the subject is full of valuable exegetical materials, the second contains a full account of the metaphysical speculations which have been connected with the person of Jesus

Christ, and the third is a very interesting developement of the practical aspects of his life. For these respective purposes the book is highly valuable to every liberal-minded student, whatever he may think of its Christology in detail. As to the hope of reconciling all branches of the Christian church together on the basis of Christ's perfection as admitted by them all, we fear this reconcilement is distant, if not impossible, for the very reason that the other two modes are persisted in though impossible. The reconcilement of exegetical Christology is impossible; so is the reconcilement of metaphysical creeds; but so long as men insist (as the great churches of Christendom all do) upon doctrinal terms of salvation as essential to Christianity, so long they will not meet on the universally admitted ground of Christ's perfection. There is indeed now, and always has been, a spiritual union (notwithstanding outward distinctions) among all practical Christians, not on the mere basis of Christ's perfection, but including also the practical morality and spiritual truths taught by him. This "communion of saints" includes all good Christians at present; and we fear we must continue to be content with it and forego visible union, until (and when will that be?) the Romish Church shall have abolished her creeds, her sacraments, her clerical assumptions and her authoritative ceremonies; till the Greek Church shall have done the same with her almost equal accumulation of un-essentials; till the Church of England shall be reformed beyond the most sanguine reformer's imagination; and, not least, till all Protestant Dissenters shall cease to see any meritorious or saving difference between orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Short of this, there can be no outward reconciliation of churches even on the basis of Christ's universally admitted perfection. That perfection may be sufficient for such a basis of union; our author is sure it is, and so are we, and so are many others; but so long as dogmatic and authoritative churches exist, it will never be *their* basis of union or co-operation either with us or even among themselves.

The book on Metaphysical Christology is especially interesting to the liberal English theologian, as shewing how some of the most forward minds in France have thought out the same doctrinal questions which have been more publicly and unreservedly debated among us.

"Christology, in the gospel records, is a religion; men have made it into a metaphysical system." Three such systems have appeared: "the Trinitarian or Nicene, according to which Jesus is identical with the Infinite Being,—God in an absolute sense; the Arian or Unitarian, according to which Jesus Christ is an intermediate being between God and human nature, united to human nature (*humanité*); and the Socinian or Humanitarian, according to which Jesus Christ is simply a man (*un simple homme*)." It will be noticed that according to the above nomen-

clature, our author does not refuse for himself the name of Unitarian, which the few Arians amongst us are indisposed to adopt, because in this country it more generally designates Humanitarian views. But in strict propriety of language it ought not to be restricted as he, on his part, restricts it, and made synonymous with Arian, to the exclusion of the Humanitarian. Unitarian properly and logically stands opposed to Trinitarian, and includes, therefore, the two grades of Arian and Humanitarian opinion, which differ infinitely less from each other than both do from Trinitarianism. But for want of a perfect nomenclature, the more comprehensive term *Unitarian* has in France come to be equivalent to *Arian*, just as in England it is usually equivalent to *Humanitarian*, according to the prevalent grade of belief in either country. Viewed thus, we cannot perhaps complain of the French idiom which speaks of us as Humanitarians; any more than (we suppose) M. Coquerel would complain of our calling him, according to our idiom, an Arian, though he calls himself *Unitaire*. We understand him as explaining the French idiom, and not as asserting the intrinsic propriety of the theological designations, when he says, "The name Unitarian is that now assumed by all theologians who acknowledge the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ and his subordination to the Father; it is right to restrict it to them, but it must not be forgotten that the name has been and still is adopted by the Humanitarians or modern Socinians" (p. 81, note). M. Coquerel, indeed, does not like the name of Arian, because the immediate followers of Arius, if not their leader himself, "failed to recognize a proper human soul in Jesus Christ," and so lost the true power of his perfect life. The following passage shews how perfectly the spirit of his theology, and how nearly its very letter, accords with that of the English Unitarians:

"The modern Arians do not choose to retain so strange a mistake. They refuse the title Arian and take that of Unitarian, as corresponding better to their belief, though it has sometimes designated the Socinians or Humanitarians. The distinctive features of this opinion are, in our day, an intense and unbounded faith in the goodness of God, who needed no bloody sacrifice to pardon his children; faith in the Bible as containing a revelation, miracles and prophecies; the idea that Christ is a divine being, but distinct from God; the idea that his humanity, notwithstanding his miraculous birth, was complete, that his holiness was perfect, and that he is, on this ground, the Saviour, model and judge of men; finally, the hope of universal restoration. The spirit of this school leads it to dwell very little on the divinity of Christ, considered as a mystery lying beyond the bounds of our reason and our faith, and having no practical aspect; but, on the other hand, to make prominent his moral character and the intire perfection of his life. It is impossible to fail of perceiving, moreover, that these opinions are distinguished above all others for their liberal tendencies, in respect both

to the inalienable rights of reason in religious matters, and to their tolerance towards the opposite theories."—II. 91.

We could not better express our own Christian belief than by the above comprehensive words, with the single omission of the vague expression respecting Christ as a "divine being," which our author himself, however, says the whole spirit of this theology forbids its adherents to dwell upon strongly. We are all at one in the great Unitarian and Christian beliefs respecting God as our Father and Christ as the perfect human example, in the best hopes for the ultimate destiny of our race, in our practical estimate of vital religion, in its free spirit, its liberality and tolerance. M. Coquerel is quite ready to welcome the taunts of orthodoxy, which fall upon him in France just as upon us in England, for believing too little :

"What? some will say, do you reduce redemption to such a trifle as that? *vous réduisez la rédemption à ce peu de chose !*)

"We have absolutely no reply to make to those who think this is a trifle; and so we proceed."—P. 322.

We must content ourselves with saying further, on this part of the book, that it includes a thorough exposition of all the various modifications which have been presented of the three great metaphysical Christologies, and that the author is perfectly at home even in the theology of Milton and Locke and the discussions of South and Sherlock, and seems to have read all the leading English and American books of Unitarian theology, down to Channing, Turner's *Lives of English Unitarians*, and John Wilson's *Concessions of Trinitarians*.

These second and third books contain also various metaphysical opinions and speculations, which remind us of the author's former volume, *Le Christianisme Expérimental*, and are much less adapted to interest the English Unitarians, or the English mind in general, than those parts of the work which we have thus far noticed.

He holds the Kantian argument for the Divine existence :

"The human mind possesses the certainty of the existence of God without being able to prove it. It will be to the eternal honour of that modern philosophy of which the genius of Kant was the chief source, to have demonstrated that the existence of God cannot be demonstrated, that the arguments for and against are in *equilibrio*, and therefore this fact is no legitimate subject for argument; and that, when reason perplexes itself with the attempt, it is only labour lost, collecting as much darkness as light, which is not really light.

"If it is true that, according to the computations of the first geometer of our age, the probability that the phenomena of astronomy should have been the effect of chance is as one in two hundred billions (200,000000,000000), the proof in favour of a First Cause seems good; but what signifies the strength of a proof, if none is needed?

"On what basis, then, does the certainty of the Divine existence rest? On the very nature of the human mind.

"Man is by nature religious; he is naturally in relation with God; he aspires towards God; and it is a contradiction to say that he is in relation with a nonentity and aspires towards a Being who does not exist. That we lift our thoughts towards God is enough. He therefore exists."—II. 7.

We confess the proof suggested and thrown aside in the second paragraph seems to us more intelligible and more forcible than that adopted in the fourth. But tastes vary, and facility of conviction varies. That the human mind, with its wonderful constitution, consciously not self-existent, proves the existence of a higher Power, is one of the best applications of the wide cumulative argument from effect to cause. But that whatever the mind conceives or aspires after (*whose* mind? *any* mind? *each* mind?) must have a real existence, we could never find as an intuition or put together as a syllogism in our own thoughts. It is well, at any rate, not to throw aside too contemptuously the argument of two hundred billions to one.

In his chapter on the Nature of Man, our author holds strongly the Libertarian view of the human will. We are not satisfied with his attempted explanation that *Christ must needs suffer* (p. 261). He seems to hold the opinion (p. 372) that physical evil is the result of moral. We are surprised to find him ascribing (p. 248) the Calvinistic notion of Christ's penal sufferings to Judaism as its origin. We refer it to heathenism; for the Jewish sacrifices, as we read them, did *not* "become substitutes for the offender and bear in his place the stroke of Divine indignation." Judaism protested against all this as heathenish and abominable. He also confounds the Passover with the sacrifices (p. 249). His speculations on the nature of *time* as consisting "merely in the succession of our thoughts" (p. 409), are either unintelligible or untrue to our less acute metaphysics; but his moral argument on the grand subject which he is discussing, that of *final universal restoration*, has no need of such an auxiliary. Was the question ever put just in this light before?

"If evil is eternally punished, God has not power over it, but evil continues the stronger and is victorious over God; evil is only conquered when it is extirpated,—a very different thing from being punished, inasmuch as the extirpation of evil implies the cessation of the punishment. We have a profound belief in the victory of God over evil.

"These considerations find evident support in the theory of degrees of salvation; neither redemption nor reprobation is uniform; and if they vary from man to man, progress is, for that reason, always possible, heaven always open, and God always ready to receive his children." P. 405.

In a note, our author hails the progress of Universalist opinions not only as traceable in English and American Unitarian

writings, but as beginning even to penetrate the English Church. He has read *Drew's Revealed Economy of Heaven and Earth* before we have.

We can find no such suitable words for concluding this notice as his own in concluding the book.

"I have done. This investigation is the conscientious work of a humble but firm and tranquil faith, the fruit of a life, now protracted, which I may say has not wanted toil. I conclude this labour by addressing to my readers that sanctifying, hopeful and fraternal text, which all my catechumens read written in my own hand on their copy of the New Testament, a passage from the great Apostle of the Gentiles, which is a true summary of this Christology, both as regards the redeemed and the Redeemer, '*Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.*'"

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE AND OPINIONS OF THE LATE MRS. MARABELLA STORY.

MRS. MARABELLA STORY, of whose useful life the pen of friendship would here present a brief sketch, was born at Philadelphia, U.S., Feb. 4, 1756, and was the youngest and last surviving of the four children of Enoch and Mary Story. Her mother's maiden name was Annis. She traced her paternal ancestry to one of those emigrants who, with the celebrated William Penn, founded the State of Pennsylvania. In referring to the circumstances of her ancestors, she writes (August, 1833),

"Ere around the broad cedar which shadows the rill
The fond ivy had learned to entwine;
Ere the works of mankind could be seen on that hill
Where the eagle reigned Lord of the pine,—
I can trace back the time, though a far distant date,
When my forefathers planted their field,
And first 'stablished the bounds of that flourishing State,
Which now a free nation has tilled.
They dying, bequeathed to their sons the fair fame
Which, unblemished, descended to me;
And the grave shall receive, still unsullied by shame,
The last faded leaf of their tree."

Her father was distantly related to Judge Story, and she preserved to the close of life her friendship for his son, Mr. Wm. W. Story. In consequence of the active part her parent took on the side of the British Government in the American Revolution, his property was confiscated, and he was compelled to quit the United States. On a temporary success of the English army, he entered Boston in triumph, riding by the Commander of the British forces, General Howe, which so excited and irritated the people, that when he was at New York ere he embarked for

England, they burnt the house in which he dwelt, and would have destroyed him and his family but for the heroic interference of a friend, Mr. Morris, who saved his life at the hazard of his own. On his arrival in England in 1777, he received a small pension from the English Government, and entered on business as an American merchant. He declined an offer made by Lord Shelburne of a living in the English Church, for which his education and character would have fitted him, on account of his disinclination to sign the Thirty-nine Articles. The loss of his only son, in Jamaica, by drowning, at the age of twenty-three years, preyed upon his spirits and brought him to a comparatively early grave, leaving his family slenderly provided for. Marabella Story, the object of this memoir, by an act of generosity to a Norwegian nobleman, Baron Anker, to whom but for his early death she would have been united, so far reduced her income as to render it necessary for her to engage in the office of governess, for which a residence of some years in Paris and her general accomplishments admirably qualified her. Baron Anker was an envoy from the Court of Sweden about the year 1815. As governess to the children of Charles Lushington, Esq., a Chinese merchant of large fortune, she lived for some years at Sidmouth. Brought up in the Established Church, she in early life saw reason to doubt the scriptural foundation of the doctrine of the Trinity, and became firmly attached to the faith professed by Unitarians, which her whole after-life so consistently adorned. During her residence in London, she attended the ministry of the Rev. E. Tagart, of whom she always spoke with affectionate respect. About fifteen years since, she removed to Sittingbourne for three years, and subsequently to Reigate, finally settling about eight years ago at Lymington (Hants). She was domiciled in these changes in the family of C. E. Powys, Esq., the son of the Rev. F. Powys. This clergyman was the successor in the rectory of Achurch, Northamptonshire, of Dr. Chambers, who, it may be remembered, received the venerable Theophilus Lindsey on his way from Catterick to London, and who himself always declined reading the Athanasian Creed, and was supposed to hold the same doctrinal opinions as Mr. Lindsey.

It was whilst Mrs. Story resided at Lymington that the writer of this brief sketch first became acquainted with her, from the circumstance of her sending him through the post some jewellery, valued at £13, to be transmitted to the Anti-slavery Bazaar at Boston, to which she afterwards made an annual contribution. In the note which accompanied the jewels, Mrs. Story said that they had been in the family upwards of a hundred years, and that she could not apply them to a better purpose than the glorious object of Negro emancipation.

An interesting incident connected with her efforts in the Anti-slavery cause in America, is recorded in the Report of the

Twenty-third National Anti-slavery Bazaar, Boston, 1857. In the packet from England was sent the subjoined letter :

"To Mrs. Chapman, Massachusetts.

"Lymington, Hants, Sept. 10, 1856.

"My dear Madam,—A favour which I venture to request gives me the pleasing occasion of addressing you.

"Will you kindly oblige me by transmitting the enclosed letter, as early as your convenience allows, to the senator, Charles Sumner? It contains a signet ring, which I offer for his acceptance as a pledge of the interest that I, in common with all England and all civilization, take in the eloquent defender, not of Kansas only, but of Liberty herself, outraged and wounded in his person.

But Freedom's battle once begun,
Bequeathed from bleeding sire to son,
Though baffled oft, *is ever won.*

"Wishing all prosperity to your noble cause and to yourself, and with kindred regards to Miss Weston, Mrs. Follen and all who resemble them, I remain, my dear Madam, very cordially and affectionately your friend,
"MARA. STORY."

The letter addressed to senator Charles Sumner was as follows:

"Honoured and esteemed Sir,—Excuse the address of an admiring stranger. Wishing not to press *myself* on your notice, I meant to offer my little tribute by the hand of my kinsman, Mr. William W. Story. His removal to England induces me to request that Mrs. Chapman will favour me by kindly transmitting it for your acceptance. The engraving was from a design by my eldest sister for a small seal, her gift to me. I have never seen a similar one, and believe it is unique. The symbol was so expressive of yourself, Harmony presided over by Wisdom, that I had the Cornelian cut for a signet ring, which I flatter myself with the hope that you will wear. I will not speak of the coward ruffian whose unparalleled outrage disgraces not his State only, but his species. The hand raised against you was intended to crush the liberty of his fatherland.

"Allow me, Sir, the honour of subscribing myself, with the highest consideration, your cordial and devoted admirer,

"Sept. 9, 1856."

"MARA. STORY."

To this letter the following reply was received:

"Washington, Feb 28, 1857.

"Madam,—Accept my tardy but sincere thanks for your present and the note which accompanied it.

"My associations with the name which you bear are of the most affectionate character, and I am happy to have them revived by an incident so pleasing and encouraging.

"The cause in which you take interest will surely prevail. Slavery must yield. The madness of its supporters is now hastening its end.

"I remain, Madam, with much respect, your faithful servant,

"CHARLES SUMNER."

The following letters on the same subject breathe a similar interest in behalf of the Anti-slavery cause:

"To Mrs. Thomas, Bristol.

"Lymington, Aug. 7, 1857.

"My dear Madam,—I received your kind letter with the Anti-slavery circular a few days since, and on Monday next will post to you a blank cover, with a Post-office order for two pounds for the Anti-slavery Bazaar, Boston.

"I am promised a few small articles for the Bazaar by some ladies (the Misses Young) of Lymington, and will send them about the middle of September to you at Bristol. My interest in the glorious cause (God's cause of Freedom) is undiminished, and will, I trust, remain so while *life lasts with me*.

"Thanks for your kind wishes for my health; 'tis very weak. Every letter I write I expect to be my last; yet here I am. Mr. Sumner said a few weeks ago to a friend of mine, that he looked to another Presidential election with hope; but it is a sick hope that is so long deferred. You have no doubt heard of Elihu Burritt's scheme for paying the slaveholders by the territorial income. He publishes a penny pamphlet (the Bond of Brotherhood) every month, which contains a *part* wholly devoted to the Anti-slavery cause. I have taken it on that account since March, when that part commenced. In the August No. is a long, *fervid* recommendation of our Garrison's Bazaar. Pray read it. I distribute to four different housekeepers here (one is a magistrate, one a physician) the Anti-slavery Advocate, and wish it may be useful. My sincere love is with Mrs. Chapman and her noble coadjutors. They have been sorely tried. Poor dear Mrs. Harriet Stowe, God comfort her in this bitter loss of her son! Please to offer my very kindest respects to Mr. Thomas and your sister, and accept the same and many thanks from, dear Madam, your grateful and affectionate

"MARA. STORY."

"Lymington, Nov. 24, 1857.

"My dear Mr. Kell,—Have you read the Bond of Brotherhood by Elihu Burritt? In March he began to propose a compensating scheme for Negro emancipation. Its success is wonderful. It appears a work of the Omnipotent. At the end of August an American Convention considers it, and the result will appear in the next Bond.

"Did you observe the case of two fugitive slave girls now in London? The case is told in yesterday's Inquirer. I *know* enough of negroes to say that they are in general most affectionate, faithful creatures. Could Mrs. Kell introduce them to a service somewhere? It would be a great charity. Not only was my own youth tended by slaves, but my father's people were all very faithful (all were domestics), and one, a fine negro, John, who had been left in Philadelphia, managed to get over to England, and came unexpectedly home, as he called it, to his beloved mistress and her children, having found his way with no other address than *Mrs. Story, England*. All my knowledge of the dark race has been favourable.

"A collection of Sir John Herschell's Essays from the Reviews is just out. It contains at the end a few verses. One is styled 'A Dream which is not all a Dream.' Pray try to read it. It appears to me in the *true* religious spirit. In fact, I dare not trust my own enthusiasm; it quite overpowers me. I hope you can get it inserted in the Inquirer. I used to know some of his family, and the lines called 'Mira' were

almost exactly what he said of his young wife. She accompanied him to the Cape.

"Please remember me kindly to Mrs. Kell and your family, in which Mr. Powys begs to unite with, yours very sincerely,

"MARA. STORY."

"Lymington, Jan. 11, 1858.

"My dear Mrs. Thomas,—Many thanks for your valued letter. Since the inaccessible Light has veiled your dear father from us, 'tis indeed a high privilege to converse with those whom he best loved. I fully appreciate it. I shall be much obliged by receiving your promised communication of the printed reports of your schools, in which I take a lively interest. Has your sister chanced to meet in Birmingham a Quaker lady, Mrs. Edmund Sturge, who is much interested in what is called the Negro's Friend Association? Mrs. E. Sturge is a very kind correspondent and friend of mine. The Society endeavours to educate the rising coloured generation, but its proceedings are limited and its funds narrow. Your ever affectionate friend,

"MARA. STORY.

"Do you read the delightful works of Mr. Arthur Helps? He also was at Birmingham when your sister was there."

Equally ardent with her zeal for the abolition of Negro slavery was her zeal for the oppressed of all nations, and her purse, often almost beyond her means, was open to the succour of the refugees from continental despotism. Her interest in them will be best seen by a quotation from a letter, bearing date 1854, to her valued friend, Mrs. James Stansfield, of Fulham, whose efforts had been strenuous in behalf of the Italian exiles:

"Thank God, Mazzini is preserved to his country and also to his many friends. I feel grateful to the American Minister who expressed himself so nobly, and I have no doubt sincerely. His country has yet many glorious sons, although I fear the taint of slavery is deeply corrupting the majority. Washington and Franklin would scarcely recognize the pride and reckless rapacity of those from whom they had anticipated a model republic. And has Switzerland forgotten her free sons, her Tells and Winkelrieds, that she prostrates herself before the once detested and defied Hapsburgh. Alas for the world! Must we leave it before we see liberty?"

In behalf of the Italian exiles, she writes:

"Do not believe that one so completely self-devoted as your noble Italian friend is placed in my mind with the common race even of patriots. He stands apart with Cato and with Washington, the disinterested, the blameless, on whom even the desire of fame, 'the last infirmity of noble minds,' has ceased to make impression; for they have vowed their hearts to liberty and virtue only. But I am a cosmopolitan, and hope *all* chains may be loosed, whether in Poland or Hungary or classic Italy,—whether by Czartoryski, Kossuth or Mazzini,—or whether Harriet Beecher Stowe leads on her gentle Amazons to the rescue of our enslaved African brethren."

Like all earnest minds, she greatly valued early religious in-

struction. Writing to her friend Mrs. Stansfield a consolatory letter after affliction, she says:

"In your son, you may be occupied by the most endearing duty. A noble employment is before you. Your labour is not spent on perishable matter. You work for eternity. In that young being entrusted to your charge, you are to build an immortal temple, which shall be inhabited by the Spirit of God. Such toils bring their own compensation of peace and joy. Elevate the mind with noble sentiments, and you remove it from the petty annoyances which disturbed and irritated it. The wind impels the wave and rends the forest, but the planet rolls on unimpeded through its orbit."

Again she writes:

"The education which is directed rather to making the pupil reason for himself and discover truth, than to teach what *we consider to be truth* authoritatively, as it induces thoughtfulness, must be an antagonist to the positiveness which so often deteriorates the character of youth. The development of reason checks vanity, and the 'hear both sides' destroys prejudice."

Again:

"Modern education applies generally to the intellect. But how necessary is the development of the affections to the perfection of intelligence itself!"

She was a liberal subscriber to Manchester College and to the London Domestic Mission, and promoted generally education among the people. Before the *Inquirer* newspaper had become self-supporting, she aided its establishment with an annual donation. Her religious opinions were deeply fixed in her affections. Having, unhappily, by her settlement at Lymington deprived herself of the power by her living example of bearing her testimony to that truth which in its purity shall be for the healing of the nations, yet could she not with the easy conscience of some Unitarians consent by her presence to sanction the adorations of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, but in her own home worshiped her God and Father, and endeavoured, by correspondence and by the distribution of tracts, to lead others to participate in the light of Christian truth which burnt so clearly in her own bosom, in that faith which was the joy of her own soul. Writing to a friend of whose religious sentiments she was uncertain, she thus endeavours to awaken an interest in the truths she loved:

"I enclose a small tract in favour of Unitarian Christianity that you may see very nearly *my views*. Such as they are, they tranquillize my mind, which never could avoid perplexity in the doctrines of self-styled orthodoxy. Pray do not be offended by my adding a little work by Dr. Clarke, which, as a concentration and abridgment of Paley's Evidences, may serve to recal them with brevity. You have no doubt read Paley's work; possibly, if re-perused, it might at present appear more forcible. Butler's Analogy is a most superior work. Indeed, it requires only observation to perceive how all the business of this world is transacted

by faith (i.e. trust), rather than certainty (mathematical demonstration). While the nature of man remains in its present state, with *free-will allowed*, I can scarcely suppose it at all consistent with certainty. We may differ about the shades of grey, but between black and white there is no spontaneity of opinion. We are as certain of the difference as we are that two and two are four."

Mrs. Story evinced great earnestness of religious feeling in that, though incapacitated by bodily weakness, for many of the closing years of life, from removing to any distance from her home, she had so strong a yearning for commemorating the Saviour's death in the Lord's Supper, that she took the bread and wine in memory of the Saviour in her solitary chamber, and was her own priest in this solemn service.

In a letter to the writer, she thus sanguinely speaks of the progress of liberal views of Christianity:

"I am pleased to hear that (what I think) a pure scriptural worship is gaining ground in this part of England. I am *fully persuaded*, even from my own experience, that Unitarian views are very acceptable to the spiritually-minded of the *humbler classes*. As for those who mistake pride and an ardent temper for religion, I fear there is great difficulty in impressing them with true Christianity under any form. Their great Master knows his own flock. May he increase its numbers!"

And again, in another letter, she writes:

"I beg to thank you for the sermon preached by Dr. Raphall on the *Unity of God* in the synagogue at Birmingham. I have often thought that if ever the Israelite accepted the blessed offers of the gospel, it would be from Unitarian ministration. It is very gratifying to find the progress it makes in Southampton. May I offer so trifling a sum as £1 to the object you propose. We are so overwhelmed with poverty at Lymington that almost all my slender fund of charity is expended in assisting absolute destitution among many of its hapless people, unable to obtain work or the food which work provides, and generally when occupied receiving the scanty wages of the week, 7s., one shilling of which is deducted by the master for house (say hovel) rent. Literally, now, they hover round you like the fowls of Heaven and claim their humble dole."

The following letter to Mrs. Thomas, of Bristol, dated Oct. 19th, 1857, indicates the warmth of her pious sentiments and desire for the promotion of what she esteemed gospel truth. After alluding to Mrs. Thomas's efforts for the Anti-slavery cause in America, she says:

"I wish I had the power to be as useful, but age and *real* infirmity have now paralyzed all my exertions. Scarcely have I strength left to write. Once I had the pen of a ready writer; none would think so now. Nor can I do any needlework. Drawing out my arm produces fever, and also the sight of the left eye is gone. Thank God! I still can manage to read by using double glasses. I have therefore spoken only to excuse my uselessness, not by any means to complain. 'They

also serve who only stand and wait.' I have little power for other more effective service, but our Father is merciful to the weak and weary.

"Let me now speak of my long-cherished silent regard for your valued family, of which I did not, until your last letter, know that you were a member. Please to say if I am right in supposing you to be the daughters of the late Rev. Dr. Lant Carpenter. If so, you have all been (even from your birth, I believe) objects of warm regard to me. Dr. Carpenter was, full fifty years ago, the preacher who always spoke to my *heart*. His writings and mild discourses were my support in the silent change of my opinions from the Established to the Unitarian view of Christianity,—opinions which time has confirmed and from which for nearly sixty years I have never varied for an instant; that is, from the broad, comprehensive view which it ever appeared to me that your dear and revered father always recommended. A *small* paper published by him, called 'The Unitarian's Appeal,' was much valued by me. I endeavoured to disseminate it; but could only do so (for my family were not of my opinion) by giving it away in every direction, by placing it continually in parts of Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens, where I hoped it might attract some eye; also, wherever I had any opportunity, in any country excursion; and also in Paris, where I found one or two truly interested, who turned it into French for their own use.

"Allow me to say that I lost my family very early. When just eighteen, I had lost, by swift succeeding decease, brother, mother, father, beloved aunt and uncle,—the only relations in England remaining to me being two sisters ten or twelve years my seniors, neither of them married, and both are now dead.

"You will judge how dear the name of Carpenter has ever been to me; and how fondly I look forward to meeting your dear father (if I am accepted) in an immortal state.

"I interest myself, too, in your brother, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, of the Manchester College in Gordon Square; but your name ever meets a response from my best feelings. Now, very dear *friend*, for I can no longer use cold terms, with my love to you ALL, and my admiration to your sister Mary, believe me, your affectionate friend,

"MARA. STORY."

Her devotional feelings not unfrequently found expression in verse. Her profound impression of the presence of the Heavenly Father was a deep well-spring of consolation to her spirit:

"MARCH, 1834.

"The powerful winds are round thee blown,
Thy Father speaks in every tone,
 And yet thou say'st *I am alone*,
 Receding clouds Heaven's glories shew,
 Fair beams on high the peaceful bow,
 Dost thou not yet His presence know?

"Lightly embrace me, thou beautiful air,
 And whisper in passing, *My Father is there*;
 He shines in the sunbeam, he breathes in the wind,
 And writes his blest laws on the page of thy mind.

“Rough winds blow round me,
 Dead leaves have crowned me,
 Fit coronal for the grey locks they bind :
 The wild voices impart
 Joyful hope to my heart ;
My Father is walking abroad on the wind.”

Her faith in Providence she thus illustrates :

“To my mind, a particular *superintending* Providence appears the legitimate conclusion from the admission of a general Providence. It seems that our imperfect ideas connect something of either fatigue or degradation with the office of a particular superintendence. Absurd ! Man judging his Maker’s powers ! Presuming that the Deity sees yet neglects the welfare of his children ! And what degradation can arise from performing the details of his own ordinances ? The all-embracing light facilitates at the same moment the operations of a Newton studying the laws of the universe, and the mechanical labours of the decrepid octogenarian knitting stockings under the shadow of a bramble.”

Her views of morals were discriminating and broad. Writing on practical unbelief, she asks,

“Are the promises not given to us as well as to our fathers ? Do we believe that, by the unchangeable fiat of the Almighty, peace always accompanies duty,—that mental happiness is actually co-existent with excellence ; and then, in direct opposition to our creed, as soon as our personal or domestic interests are affected, regularly follow worldly plans and courses, and, knowing that we cannot serve two masters, choose Mammon ? Surely our conduct marks little confidence in our principles ; but, verily, we shall have our reward.”

“*Practical unbelief*.—We say, ‘the promises of God.’ Do *we* act in consequence ? If we do not, can we believe our own profession ?”

“It would be well if we reflected oftener on the great Exemplar set before us ; if, in the various difficult passages of life, we asked our hearts, How would Jesus have acted in a similar situation ? and then add, ‘Go thou and do likewise.’”

“What errors has not the change of the term *love* into that of *charity* in our English version of the Scriptures caused. I speak from experience. By the notion of almsgiving superseding the idea of love, we positively endeavour to buy a place in heaven. Love is so comprehensive a term ; of course it includes almsgiving, for ‘it is the bond of perfectness, the fulfilling of the law, it never faileth.’ But how far beyond our English idea of charity (even including charitable constructions of others’ actions, i. e. candour) does that of love extend ? We *love* our parents, benefactors, Christ, God. We cannot be said to have *charity* for them. We may love the humblest and most abject miserable at the very instant that we are performing the details of charity towards them. Charity often suggests the idea of patronage, even of pride. This is incompatible with love, which strikes at the very root of pride—the Satan, the adversary, the Proteus Prince of this world with whom the Prince of Peace had no part or lot.”

Again, in illustrating this Christian affection :

“Love, in our Scriptures mistranslated charity, is of the nature of

light. Like that, it forms a whole rainbow of variously coloured affections which shall mingle and brighten into that spotless whiteness we call light, that immaculate purity we call love."

Again :

"The Greeks (I am told) included the graces, the muses and the social virtues under the single appellation of charities; whence our plural, charities, is generally used in a more extensive sense than the singular, charity. Charity in this sense is strictly the charity of scripture, which yet is, six times out of ten at least, considered as a more limited idea. The Greek term is, I think, more fully expressed by the English 'love,' taken of course in the generic sense as uncombined with individual passion."

In illustrating the importance of this divine affection, she writes :

"The marriage garment, what is it? When we consider the great importance attached to the principle of love, when we also remember that Christ declares it to be the badge by which his disciples shall be distinguished, may we not reasonably conclude that love is the marriage-robe without which no man can be admitted to the feast, and that he who adventures to enter the kingdom of Christianity with proud, uncharitable sentiments, being wholly unfitted for the society, will be of necessity expelled, at least till he have procured the proper badge of reception."

Again :

"Where earthly love and heavenly affection co-exist, the last in time purifies and almost absorbs the first. An accurate observer discovers the difference at first sight. One is selfish, the other expansive. They act on the soul like heat on the rose. Who does not know that the flower expands in the sunbeam and shrivels in the fire? The human individual seems to be composed of three distinct parts—body, mind, soul; i. e. matter, reason, affection. The two first fail not; I think *never* the last. 'Love never faileth, although language and knowledge shall vanish away' (1 Cor. xiii. 8). The soul, then, i. e. love ('God is Love'), is, I presume, a divine emanation intended for a future existence, which will be one of full apprehension, unshackled by the mechanism of mind, reasoning, recollecting, combining. While the body and even the understanding change, not to say fail, how constantly do good affections improve and grow warmer and purer with time! Like the fire which is so often used to symbolize them, they become more vivid in proportion to their purification, until, fixed at length on a *Perfect Object*, assuming all their genuine energy and strong as death, they quit a world which can no longer afford them adequate support and rise to their celestial home."

There is much force in the following remark :

"Selfishness is said to spring up in youth. I think far otherwise. Passion is selfish, and what I may call impassioned selfishness, i. e. self-will, is generally developed in youth. Age has acquired experience, has known the mockery of professing friendship, has felt the chiliness of heart that springs

From benefits forgot,
From friend remembered not.

This deathlike stagnation of the affections produces icy tranquillity rather than selfishness in the heart which, when young, was tender and true."

Another result of age is thus described :

"As passions decay and consideration claims its due place in the mind, we become more lenient to the faults of others; make just allowances for the circumstances which have heightened, if not produced them; judge of the tree by its fruits, rather than by our own feelings, and are no longer angry with the currant for not being a grape, or with the apple because Nature has not allowed it the flavour of the grape."

And again :

"Who postpones the correction of habit or temper to the season of age, will find that, as the passions lose strength, the power of resistance also languishes and is unfit for the conflict. Let age repose on its laurels.

"We have often laughed at the French plum-pudding made without a pudding-bag. The fable has its moral. The talents and excellences of life are useless to ourselves and others unless subjected to the gentle confinement of a considerate good-temper. There are citron and fruit and spices, sugar and spirit, and even the nutritious flour, all lost for want of the pudding-bag.

"Strong words of reprobation applied to slight faults denote a violent and, of consequence, an inconsiderate disposition. Sometimes in youth this mode of speech is mere affectation, but 'tis surely pitiable to find any person provided with so large a stock of superfluous hatred that they can afford to throw it away lavishly.

"Men generally confuse the idea of justice with severity, widely distinguished in scripture. Justice, the first of virtues, admits no modification. All others must either be resolved into justice (which consists in giving to every being its rights), or they must at times bend to circumstances. Justice is the white radiance which absorbs the varied rainbow of all other virtues."

One other feature of her character deserves to be recorded : I allude to her cheerfulness of mind, her filial resignation amid the growing infirmities of age and the almost isolation of her situation,—a cheerfulness which sprang from vivid faith in an overruling Providence and the soul-elevating doctrine of immortality brought to light by the gospel.

She writes :

"You ask how I manage to be cheerful in age and loneliness? I draw drafts on futurity and take resignation in present payment."

At another time :

"You say you envy me my tranquil life. True, I am now on the smooth water that precedes the great fall; but, in order to attain it, I passed the rapids, and so must you."

And again :

"A vague presentiment of a future state envelopes me and renders my

present existence solemn but not sad. Yet I ever have and still do believe in the morality of cheerfulness. It *harmonizes* society."

She beautifully remarks, "The employment of *time* provides the inheritance of *eternity*."

She argued closely and warmly in support of her religious opinions. Thus she writes:

"I profess not the Parliamentary but the Christian religion. I cannot imprison the Omnipresent in the circuit of Thirty-nine Articles, nor admit the spiritual dominion of my fallible fellow-creature. The King of kings is the Supreme Head of my church. I worship the God of Abraham, of Moses and of Christ, the ineffable Jehovah."

Again:

"Trinitarians tell you that their doctrine is *inferred* from many passages of scripture. Unitarians deliver their doctrine in the very injunctions of scripture. When my director plainly *enjoins* an act, can I act contrariwise because I *infer* from some less clear language that an opposite course will please him better? To me, such conduct appears presumptuous and disobedient. Clear injunction supersedes inference."

She thus argues for the Unity of God:

"How do Trinitarians account for the attendance of Christ and (*after his resurrection*) that of his apostles on the service of the sanctuaries? That service was strictly Unitarian: 'Hear, O Israel! Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.'"

She comments on Gal. iii. 5, 6, 7, "And the hearing of faith:"

"They who are of faith, i. e. all the nations, shall be blessed with faithful Abraham. But did Abraham even know the modern doctrines of Atonement and a Triune Deity, &c.? Faith and obedience were connate in him. He believed that God commanded him, and accordingly he obeyed implicitly. Perhaps in studying the Scriptures it will be found that the faith there mentioned is always an obeying faith."

Referring to the Athanasian Creed, she writes:

"Athanasius, or whoever had the honour of composing the series of contradictions which bears his name, was the sphinx of theology who propounded an inexplicable enigma and then unscrupulously damned (as she devoured) all who could not explain it. Belief is required; and belief, independent of some sort of reasoning, is impossible."

Again, on the same subject:

"The beautiful simplicity of Christian truth is hidden beneath the rubbish of centuries of theological labour. The inquirer must undergo toils similar to those at Pompeii. Then he may behold the fair beauty of the temple."*

The truly Christian lady of whose life I have endeavoured to preserve a few memorials, died April 8, 1858, at the advanced age of 82, of acute bronchitis, after a short illness endured with

* Mr. Kell has favoured us with other extracts from Mrs. Story's MSS., some of which we hope to make use of hereafter, but they are of too fragmentary a character to be conveniently given in another continuous article.

the serene tranquillity which might have been anticipated. Her remains were followed to their last resting-place by her long-trying and valued friend, C. E. Powys, Esq., who watched over her decline of life with almost filial veneration and affection. Many, very many, not only of the poor and distressed of her own neighbourhood, but the down-trodden of distant lands, had reason to lament her departure as of one whose heart was ever open to the cry of the unfortunate, and who to the utmost verge of her means relieved their wants. Amongst those who felt her removal from this sphere of usefulness, the writer of this sincere tribute of respect regards it as a cause of deep gratitude to Almighty God that he was permitted in the closing period of her life to become her friend. He cannot dwell in thought on that noble spirit, encased in a frail body, in her retired abode, the sole survivor of her family in England, yet meeting every trial with Christian cheerfulness, without deriving spiritual improvement from such retrospect; and he would hope that this brief record of her life and opinions may lead others to seek, as she did, aid to discharge aright the duties of life, from the great Fountain of all strength and consolation.

EDMUND KELL.

PLAIN REASONS FOR MISSIONARY EFFORT ON THE PART OF UNITARIANS.

A DISCOURSE BY REV. J. R. BEARD, D.D.

MATTHEW xxviii. 19: "Go ye therefore and teach (make disciples of) all nations."

SUCH is the great commission given by Christ to his apostles,—the greatest and most solemn commission ever given on earth. The commission is in its nature universal in time as well as space: as no country, so no age, to which it does not extend. It is universal also as to individuals. Christianity recognizes no sacerdotal order. Every Christian is a priest, and so it is the duty of every disciple, so soon and so far as he is a disciple, to make disciples of others. In this wide and comprehensive sense was the great commission first interpreted, and in consequence the disciples went out everywhere preaching the glad tidings of great joy which were to all people. In consequence, the light from heaven fell on every civilized land. From Jerusalem as a centre it passed to Samaria. Then the people of Antioch were saluted by its reviving beams. Striking east and west, it went in that direction to Damascus and Babylon, and in this direction to Thessalonica, Corinth, Athens and Rome; and ever spreading on all sides as it went, it soon, like "a sea of glory," extended over the surface of society, and sowed the seeds of that harvest

which it has taken eighteen hundred years to reap, and which after all is only the first sheaf of the great "harvest of the earth." Still is the spiritual husbandry proceeding, and still, till time shall be no more, will it proceed. We who are of the Unitarian Church are invited to enter into the vineyard and apply ourselves to its labours. For myself, I accept the invitation. The duty has received practical acknowledgment by me from the earliest period of my religious recollections. While yet at College, I took part in the formation of a local Missionary Society which was not without effects in the villages and rural towns in the midst of which I received my special training for ministerial duties, and which has still a memorial of its existence at least in one new place of worship. As soon as I settled in this important district, I became officially connected with a Missionary Society which still survives, after having done much good, and of which the new chapel and school at Swinton may be regarded as one of its more marked results. I regard it as the special privilege of my life that I took part in founding the Unitarian Home Missionary Board for the education of students for the ministry, and now I am about to plead for an institution which may be regarded as a natural, if not necessary, supplement to the Board, and which is specially called for by the signs of the times. These facts are mentioned in order to shew you that it is no casual thought I have now undertaken to expound, but a fixed and long-entertained conviction. Missionary work I have from the first considered as a Christian duty, an important duty, a duty devolving on every Christian minister, a duty devolving on every disciple of Christ. The grounds of that duty are to me equally simple and cogent, and I purpose now to lay before you a few plain reasons why you should, directly or indirectly, take your share in the honourable task. The reasons I shall adduce divide themselves into two classes—first, those which are common to Unitarians with other disciples of Christ; and, secondly, those which are in the main peculiar to Unitarians.

I. 1. At the head of the reasons for missionary effort which are common to Unitarians with other disciples of Christ, I place the words, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations." The terms of the commission as reported by Mark are these: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." The same scripture adds as a comment that the apostles "went forth and preached everywhere" (xvi. 15—20). There is the command on the one side, and on the other the practical interpretation. Jesus said, "Go," and they went. The command addressed originally to the eleven, in spirit extends to all disciples. So was it understood by Paul, though not of the eleven, and by Timothy and Titus, Paul's spiritual sons, who as soon as they had received the good news into their own hearts, set about proclaiming it to others. Thenceforward a long and

broad line of Christian teachers appeared in the world, who, some in the ministry (as it is called), others out,—some mainly with the voice, others mainly with the pen, called on men to “repent and believe the gospel,” and so not only established the church, but spread the spirit and the power of Christ in all classes and in successive generations. The labour of love has come down to this day—is it now to stop? The duty—is it at an end? Stop of itself the river will not, cannot—are we then to erect flood-gates to arrest the flowing stream? We cannot, if we would, bring its majestic waves to a stand-still. Better to put ourselves on their bosom, that we may work with Divine Providence to direct their course.

2. The missionary effort is of universal obligation. While the tenor and the practical interpretation of the great commission leave us no alternative but to take our share of the heat and burden of the day, the particular terms employed by Christ involve the universality of the obligation: “*Therefore;*” “*Go ye therefore.*” * Why? Because “all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” The nature and the object of that power are clearly shewn in John xvii. 2, when, speaking of himself, Jesus declares, “Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee, as Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given him.” It is “power over all flesh,” and power issuing in “eternal life” to all flesh, that Jesus received, and which he made the ground of his great commission; as if he had said, “Raised from the dead, and so set free from the restraints of material existence, and placed at the right hand of the Father Almighty, I am become the Saviour of all mankind, and first of those who now believe. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, that all may share the good I have received of God the privilege to bestow. I am the Good Shepherd; my sheep are there, scattered over the world; go and gather them all in, that there may be one flock under me, the one Shepherd. One with God in spirit, aim and operation, I bear the same relation to all men of this age and of all ages; for my relation is to man as man; and consequently the charge I give is a universal charge, and can be fully executed then only when whatever the Father has given me is in my hands.” If the charge is universal, the duty is universal. The charge and the unity remain so long as there is one sheep unfolded on the wastes, one ear of corn ungleaned among the stubble.

3. The obligation to missionary effort is still in force. If the obligation is universal, it is so in time as well as space. Indeed, spiritual relationships know nothing of the distinctions of time

* The οὖν (therefore) is omitted by Tischendorf, but the logical connection remains the same.

and space. Time is only the succession of our thoughts denoted along the bed-roll of events. Let the events of earth cease, and time is no more, and space is only thought conditioned by distance; remove the condition, and thought, free of restriction, is all-pervasive like the air, like the sunbeam. Freedom is the essence of the spirit, and since the kingdom of Christ is a spiritual kingdom, it is everywhere, in all climes, in all ages, in all conditions, being, like the omnipresent God, in all, through all and over all. Hence the command of Christ comes to you and to me equally with every other disciple, no matter what the age, no matter what the place. The obligation has but one condition, namely, discipleship. The moment a man becomes a disciple of Christ, he contracts the obligation of becoming a missionary. There is here no option, no escape. You cannot be a disciple without being a missionary of Christ. Learning and teaching are parts of the same Christian act, elements of the same Christian life. Into at least the inner recesses of that life—its true light, its sacred powers, its divine glories—you cannot enter but through the portal of teaching. Even of its outer parts nothing but the mere surface can be touched, unless by those who teach as fast as they learn; and who, after the first step of their conversion to God, ever learn by teaching. As a spiritual essence and a spiritual life, Christianity possesses attributes quite peculiar to itself. Of these, the principal is, that growth comes from external exercise, not less than internal evolution. As “faith without works is dead, being alone,” so works minister to faith the air and the sunbeam which make it healthy and vigorous. A geometrician may be made by the mere study of the requisite manuals, but no books will make a Christian. Only on those who work for God by working for man, does God bestow his Holy Spirit. If we would be one with Christ in life, we must be one with him in act.

4. The obligation will cease, then, only when the task is accomplished. “Teach *all* nations;” in the original the Lord says, “Make disciples of all *the* nations.” “All the nations”—the phrase is unrestricted. He does not say, “all the nations that now are,” but “all the nations;” nor does he say, all the nations that may rise in coming ages, but absolutely, “all the nations;” consequently he meant all the nations of the earth, all the nations that are, all the nations that will be. But he that says all, says every one. What are nations but aggregates of individuals? The injunction is, then, “Christianize the whole of human kind, Christianize every separate man, woman, child.” What a grand enterprise! “Make every one as happy as yourselves, make every one as holy as I am, universalize my spirit, and as my spirit so my power, and as my power so my blessedness.” Is the work completed? Are the Saviour’s benignant instructions fulfilled? Never will they be wholly accomplished until God is

all in all. How far, alas! are we of this day from that blissful consummation! What ignorance to remove! what brutishness to overcome! what vice to extirpate! what sin to put away! what woe, what wailing, to still! Terrible are the evils with which society is yet scourged. How many thousands are at this moment perishing alike in body and soul! The blind grope in the darkness of their minds. The hungry sink from exhaustion. The lips of the thirsty burn with intolerable heat. The sick moan, the dying are without hope. Even children are adepts in crime, and fathers and mothers subsist on the degradation of their young ones. The task finished? So huge is the task as almost to deter by reason of its magnitude. The longer our delay, the more formidable does the task become.

5. But neglect is reproved not only by the urgency of the duty, but also by gratitude. Let us well conceive how the matter stands. The appeal is to the Christian disciple. To the Christian disciple Christ himself says, "Christianize thy neighbour, Christianize thy brother. Freely thou hast received, freely give. Thy lamp has been kindled by me that thou mayst kindle another's lamp. I have made thee wise unto salvation that thou mayst be a channel of salvation to thy fellow-men. Art thou freed from sin? it is that thou mayst confer the same advantage on some one else. Hast thou ceased to fear death? it is that thou mayst liberate those who still groan in the same bondage. Art thou at peace? communicate thy peace. If thou hast the spirit of the gospel in thee, thou wilt spare no effort to propagate the gospel." Here is the obligation to missionary effort as arising from our own experience of its advantages. For how have we become Christian, if not by the preaching of the gospel? Shall we not transmit the torch we have received? or shall we invert it and extinguish its light? Alas! so do many; and the result is darkness and death. But can such neglect be justified? Is not such a breach of Christ's command an act of ingratitude? The ingratitude is so great as to be all but inconceivable;—all but? totally inconceivable on the part of persons who are really become Christians. Yes, the Christian must Christianize. To Christianize is to the Christian as natural, as necessary, as it is to water to flow, light to shine, music to diffuse its melodies. "The love of Christ constraineth us," says Paul, "because he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again" (2 Cor. v. 14). And so we are led to see that

6. He who knows Christ as a benefactor will in that knowledge find an irresistible reason for becoming a benefactor in Christ's place to those for whom Christ died. Again, hear what the self-sacrificing apostle to the Gentiles declares: "Ye having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed and therefore have I spoken, we also believe and therefore speak"

(2 Cor. iv. 13). Do you believe that Christ died for all? Then will you be glad to do your part that his gospel may be offered to all. Do you believe that the gospel is a blessing, a very great blessing, the greatest blessing a man can receive, the greatest blessing that God can bestow? Then the words of the apostle will be your words, and you will say, "I believe, and therefore I speak." Yes, this is the great qualification. No need to urge the missionary work on those who have personal experience of the worth of Christianity. Full themselves to overflowing, they cannot help spreading the waters of life around them. Christ is too precious to them not to be offered by them to friends and relatives. Loving Christ, they love his spirit and wish to diffuse it; they love his doctrine and wish to disseminate it; they love his purposes and wish to forward them; they love those whom he loves and wish to do them good; and so their whole soul is borne, with combined action, on such endeavours as are of a nature to establish and extend the kingdom of Christ on earth.

These are such general reasons as the occasion allows me to present. If I sum them up, they say to us, Encourage the missionary enterprise because, 1, it is commanded by Christ; 2, because it is a natural result of his official elevation; 3, because as a spiritual work the duty is permanent; 4, because as a remedial operation it is still needed and greatly needed; 5, because it claims attention on the grounds of the benefits it has conferred on yourself; 6, because in virtue of its influence you have been brought into intimate, personal relations with Christ, so as to find in him a benefactor,—a benefactor in those matters which form your character and determine your condition. These reasons you have in common with disciples of Christ in general. They are the reasons which recommend the evangelizing of the world apart from any special considerations. Working on this basis, you become conscious of another general reason; namely, that by so doing you are a living and active member of the great Christian community spread now over all lands, and stretching back from this moment to the days of the apostles. Such a sentiment is of great value. It is full of support. It is full of satisfaction. Who does not love to feel himself one in the midst of a consentient many? Insulation is cold, cheerless, dreary. Not willingly in anything do we stand aloof from our fellow-men; least of all in religion. Religion flourishes by communion. Communion is all but indispensable to the very life of religion. Therefore did the wise Master-builder in founding his kingdom erect a church. Within that church—especially the spiritual and invisible, the real church—there is a home for every disciple; shelter from the smiting sun and the paralyzing frost and the pelting storm; shelter and kindly warmth and salubrious sustenance, with smiling looks and sympathizing hearts and wise counsel and ready co-operation; while over all is one God the

Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour, and one Spirit of holiness.

II. And so I am brought to the reasons for missionary effort which are in the main peculiar to Unitarians. I say in the main, because these reasons, as flowing from the substance of the gospel, will be more or less shared by sincere and earnest persons of other denominations.

1. You believe Unitarianism to be, if not the gospel, yet the nearest approach to the gospel you are able to make. Whatever views you may have held aforetime, to whatever views you may be brought hereafter, at present Unitarianism is the gospel, the form of divine truth you have been led to adopt, the form of divine truth which satisfies your intelligence and nourishes your affections, and renews, and in renewing ennobles, your life. This one fact determines your duty. Unitarianism being this to you, claims, and has a right to, your active services. With you, all the general reasons I have adduced acquire a special application. Unitarianism is your gospel, and your allegiance to the gospel demands your zeal on behalf of Unitarianism. Think not to avoid this inevitable conclusion. If Unitarianism, in your judgment, is not the gospel, renounce it, and seek again for the gospel. If to you it is not the word of God, it is the word of man, and by it you must not stand. But then why are you here? Why do you worship apart from the great body of Christian disciples? Your presence declares that in the main Unitarianism is with you and for you the gospel. Well, then, regarding it as such, treat it as such, act towards it as such; as such, love it, cherish it, promote it;—promote it in your own life, your own home, your own church, your own neighbourhood, your own country—in the world at large.

2. The consideration just offered enables me to explain what it is that in my judgment Unitarians ought to labour to propagate. And you will see at once that, with the views I hold, I cannot be in favour of any sectarian or schismatical movement in the church. It is not a rent in the body of Christ that I desire to make. It is not a party that I want to build up. It is neither Arius, Priestley nor Channing that I would have preached. My motto is, "None but Christ," "none but Christ." It is his gospel I am bound to publish. It is his work I am bound to attempt. In aim and purpose, if not in act, I wish to be one with the Head of the church, trusting that oneness with him in aim and purpose will ever unite me more closely with him in act, and so make me altogether, as his disciple, so his servant and fellow-worker. A design so comprehensive must commend itself to every liberal mind. Those who are not Unitarians, acting on this principle themselves, would declare that the principle ought to be observed by us. Those who are Unitarians, if Unitarians indeed, cannot do other than approve the principle,

for it is the principle under the guidance of which they have become Unitarians, or at all events can justify their Unitarian position. And the principle is the more worthy of acceptance because it bids us conduct our propagandism in the main by proclaiming and enforcing truth, instead of denouncing and exposing error. I say "in the main;" for while the first and the great business of the Christian minister is to preach the gospel, he must not shrink, when and where necessary, to confute and destroy falsities that may have assumed its name and taken its place. In this iconoclastic service, however, Providence has gone before us and prepared our way, if not greatly performed our task; for,

3. Another special reason for a Unitarian propagandism is, that there is at the present hour a breaking-up of the old forms of theological opinion which is attended with danger to the very substance of religion. Evidences crowd on the sight. What is to be the result? Disbelief of the creeds is all but universal with the intelligent. Yet to disbelieve one article is to renounce all; for in human structures of divinity, if one beam proves rotten, the whole edifice first totters and then falls. What then is to be the result? You are in such a matter not to expect nice and judicious discrimination, as if men could exactly lay down the line between perishable error and imperishable truth, between divine commands and human traditions. Great changes of thought, and not least religious thought, are thorough and sweeping; they move over the surface of society like the storm, levelling high and low as they proceed. Already has disbelief produced scepticism; scepticism is passing into secularism; and secularism is spiritual darkness and death. To do anything toward warding off such an evil is worth any labour we can bestow, any sacrifice we may have to make. And, finally,

4. We are encouraged to take in hand the task by tokens more favourable than were ever before known. Not till the beginning of this century (A.D. 1813) were Unitarians in England permitted by law to give public utterance to their convictions. Even after the recognition of religious liberty by the British senate, the force of old persecuting laws punished such faithfulness with the loss of property. Nor was it until the Dissenters' Chapels Bill was passed in the year 1844, that we were left free to follow the guidance of conscience. Before, and especially since that date, our body has been gradually rising to a sense of its duty as a living branch of the universal church. One result is the recommendation of a scheme of missionary action made by the Provincial Assembly at their last meeting, held at Dukinfield, in June 1858. That scheme contemplates the affording of aid to weak congregations, and the foundation of new ones, in the province of Lancaster and Chester. The Assembly whence it emanates is carried back by authentic historical records to

the year 1689,* the very year in which the Toleration Act was passed, relieving nonconformity to the Established Church from being a crime at law. No sooner were the hands of our predecessors unmanacled, than they began to build the house of God. Hence arose many places of worship in whose sacred shrine there was kept burning, and burning with holy oil, the lamp of unqualified religious freedom. Forth from that shrine has our Unitarianism come. Dear ought it to be to us from its origin. No small guarantee of its divinity does it bring with it, in that it is the child of liberty of thought and disinterestedness of action. Herein, too, it gives us reason to expect for it acceptance on the part of the public, when fairly and effectively placed under its eye; for is it not the same spirit and power of free thought and free speech which have introduced the changes of opinion to which I have referred? Those changes themselves call loudly for the light which Unitarians have to offer. Unbelief is too unnatural and too restless and too negative and too cold a state of mind for men to acquiesce in except on necessity. It is because they love the true, that men abandon the false. Quenchless and ceaseless is man's yearning after religious light and religious peace. That yearning you can satisfy in others, because you have satisfied the same craving in yourselves. Having learnt to harmonize the claims of reason and the claims of faith in your own minds, you are specially fitted to assist others in the important task. Will you refuse your aid? In so noble a work even failure is no discredit; but fail altogether you cannot, if only because while handing, be it only a cup of cold water, to a thirsty brother in the spirit of a brother, you will assuredly receive a brother's reward.

RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORM COMMUNITIES OF GERMANY.

THE principles and rules which the Breslau Reform community had discussed and accepted, were diffused through all Germany by the press, and in several large towns liberal Catholics united in consequence of this example and established communities. Before I organized the Reform community in Breslau, Czersky had established, a short time after the letter to Arnoldi appeared, a community in Schneidemühl, a small town near the province Posen, but as he had retained the Athanasian Creed, the dogmatism of the Catholic church and the Mass in the German language, the enlightened Catholics of the larger towns did not find

* This appears to have been a revival of the Assembly, for earlier documents shew it to have been in existence as early as 1646, from which date until 1662 its meetings were regularly held, the first at Preston.

in this creed their conviction expressed. However, in some towns where people did not yet see an essential difference between the community of Breslau and that of Schneidemühl, Czersky was first called, being nearer to them, as, for example, in Dantzic. In order to prevent differences and not to give to our antagonists an opportunity of making disunion, I wrote in the commencement of March to R. Blum, presiding member of the community of Leipzig, asking him to call a council, that we might at once settle the differences and not allow the governments to mix in our movement. Thus the first council was held at the end of March, 1845, and attended by deputies of about 14 Reform communities. If I had called this first meeting at Breslau, the Protestant party at Berlin, headed by the bigoted Gerlach, would have persuaded Czersky and the deputy of the Berlin community not to join, in order not to lose the favour of the Government, which was decidedly manifested already for Czersky, in opposition to the principles of the Breslau community.

By transferring, however, the basis of our yet small Reform party (or army for religious progress, as we were then called) from the Prussian dominions into the middle of Germany, the Prussian court party, which is at present well known for their Russian and Popish predilections, could not strike the blow which they had then intended for the Breslau Reform party, and I gained time to see the leaders of the various communities of the larger towns, and unite them by a general organization for further action and defence. The object of this cunning party was to raise *one* of the presiding members of the Berlin community, a young lawyer who had accepted Czersky's creed and rules, to the dignity of a *German Catholic State official*; i. e. make him einen Deutsch-katholischen Consistorial Rath, similar as in the Protestant Church; in fact to form a new State Church on a small scale out of our Reform communities, and tie us down to their creeds and commands. It was not for this that I had struggled and suffered, and I vowed they should not get at us as long as I could move. Relying upon their power and influence, they thought that they would gain easily the victory over us, and they did not prevent Czersky (who did not know what was intended by that party) and the deputy of the Berlin community from coming to Leipzig. From the addresses and letters I had received nearly from all parts of Germany, I felt sure that we should have a victory at Leipzig. With regard to our fundamental principles it could not be otherwise, for we had fixed the independence of each individual community and their right to arrange their own affairs, as well as the duty of altering their rules and creeds with the progress in religious culture and conviction. Therefore it proved to us no occasion for disputing about matters of belief, for we granted them full liberty and asked the same for ourselves. The deputy of the Berlin com-

munity made at the commencement some difficulties, but as this Protestant State Church party numbered only two communities, Schneidemühl and Berlin, and the other *eleven*, we arranged soon everything amicably, being supported by the immense enthusiasm which was manifested by the nation at large, and which was daily increasing.

Czersky being a straightforward man, who had not the slightest notion of the sly policy of the Puseyite party in Berlin, did not make any difficulties, as he saw that we had no desire to interfere with the affairs of his community, and that the council only laid down a general basis and framed an organization for united action. As soon as our resolutions had been published by the press, and the people learnt that *unity* was established between Czersky and myself, the enthusiasm grew stronger; and as just at the time the Easter fair took place, and Leipsig was visited by traders and manufacturers from all parts of Germany and from other countries, the good results of our meetings and our liberal resolutions were spread through the whole country. We received now invitations from liberal Protestants, who rejoiced that we had established such principles and such an organization as they wished for their own church, and especially that we did not exclude any sincere conviction. After having thus gained a *German* instead of a Prussian *basis* and increased strength, it was time for me to thwart the intrigues of the Puseyite State Church party in Berlin entirely, and by uniting the Berlin community with the progressive Reform party, to drive those frivolous bigots from the ground of the new Reformation which they had impudently invaded. R. Blum and the Saxon friends wanted me to stay for a time in Saxony and to help them, but I told them how matters stood in Berlin, and that I could not lose any time. I wrote to the presiding members of the Berlin community, among whom I had personal friends, that I would come with J. Czersky to celebrate the *first divine service*, for they had not yet a preacher. When I arrived in Berlin, I made the necessary preparations for our service, which was celebrated in accordance with the forms of the Breslau community, and the liberal creed fixed at Leipsig was read.

The great majority of the audience were liberal Protestants, who had no belief in the Trinity; and this was the case likewise with the members of the new Reform community. The result was not doubtful; the presiding members declared themselves in agreement with the liberal resolutions of the council in Leipsig, and gave up the Athanasian Creed. The citizens, magistrates and many liberal officials made a great demonstration in our favour, by inviting us to a festival and presenting me with Luther's wedding-ring. In consequence of this general and increasing enthusiasm for the new religious movement, the Puseyite court party (to whom also the Queen belonged) were

not only defeated, but the Government found themselves under the necessity of fixing a law for the regulation of our affairs. The King, therefore, gave a *Cabinet's order*, that the State officials should not mix themselves up with our movement, nicht hindern und nicht fördern. That was all that we wanted at that time, for we desired no State interference, and could rely upon our own strength. That the reader may not think I lay too much stress upon that cunning Puseyite party, headed by Gerlach, Stahl, Wagner, and represented by the *Kreuz-zeitung*, I need only mention that this party has acted as slyly, as recklessly, during the reign of the diseased King. They induced him to suppress the liberal constitution of 1848, to which he had sworn (the Prussian coup d'état) by main force, and then the German Parliament. This party kept the King tied to Russia when all Germany was ready to unite with England in the Russian war, and under their revengeful government during ten years Germany has suffered as scarcely in any other period of this century. When the government was left to the Prince Regent, it was made a condition that the right of amnesty should be left to the diseased King, for they wished not to interrupt the exiles in their repentance, and to see them saved again in heaven.

JOHANNES RONGE.

(To be continued.)

THE "ACTS OF THE APOSTLES."*

To the positive evidence, arising from the actual contents and obvious purpose of the book, may be added the negative testimony arising from the absence of any marks of the influences of the second century. If, before the opening of that century, the controversy to which the book refers had passed away, other questions had taken its place, and furnished continued occasion for ecclesiastical agitation and strife. The formation of sects, isolated from the communion of the great body of believers, had begun; and the idea of a catholic church, as distinct from these bodies of separatists, was gaining ground: within the limits of that church fierce contests, such as that about proper time for the observance of Easter, arose, and were carried on with discreditable vehemence; and the fantastic theories of Gnosticism were in course of development. But as to these, the book is silent. There are no traditions incorporated which would bear on them. Even where the incidents or persons mentioned would naturally have led to some such notice, we do not find any. We have the account of Simon of Samaria (ch. viii.), but of his subsequent

* Continued from p. 148.

visit to Rome and his reception there we have no hint, though we find them in Justin Martyr; neither is there any notice of the similarity, which was subsequently believed to exist, between his views and those of the Gnostics; or at all of the existence of these sectaries. Of the observance of Easter not an intimation is given; for the word in our version (in Acts xii. 4) is a gross, and apparently a wilful mistranslation of the sacred text; and if there is no mention of the observance of the festival, of course there can be nothing to decide the question of its proper season. In a word, everything speaks to us of the first century, or rather of the apostolic age, and nothing of a later period. We are led to the same conclusion as to the date of the work, both by what the writer tells us and by what he omits to tell us.

The evidence, whether positive or negative, which I have produced, is derived from the consideration of the work as a whole; our deductions, therefore, relate to the time when it assumed its present form, without touching on the question whether it is, in any part, composed of materials previously existing. My arguments would lose none of their relevancy or force if it could be shewn that the work was simply a compilation of materials which the compiler found ready to his hand. If they are convincing, it would still be clear that the compilation was of the apostolic age, and consequently that the documents composing it were contemporary with the apostles. But there is one link in the chain of internal evidence by which the work is traced to Luke, which we should lose, viz., the evidence that the writer was a companion of Paul, derived from the use in various parts of the narrative of the first person, thus identifying the writer as a companion of the apostle. Though it would still appear that the book originated in the apostolic day, it would not appear that the writer was at any time personally cognizant of what he related, but only that he had in one part incorporated the testimony of an eye-witness and actor in the scenes he records.

The argument for the authorship of Luke derived from the passages in which the writer speaks in the first person, is one of the most obvious, and, I still think after a close scrutiny, one of the most forcible. But it is met, as appeared in the discussion from which these papers have originated, by the reply, that the passages in question may be parts of a journal of one of Paul's companions, incorporated by the writer of the book in his history, without any notice of their being quotations, and without the change of person or other grammatical correction which should have been made. It is to this reply, then, that I must now turn.

The first thing that strikes one with respect to it is, that the hypothesis contained in it is evidently resorted to in order to obviate a difficulty; it is not one that the passages naturally suggest. I do not mean this as decisive against the hypothesis, because we all have, not unfrequently, to account for phenomena

in ways which we should not resort to but for the difficulty belonging to some simpler way of accounting for them. But it is a presumption against it; and when we come to examine the matter closely, we shall see that this presumption grows into an insurmountable difficulty.

As this suggested incorporation of the fragments of a document of earlier date is connected with the impeachment of the historical character of another part of the narrative, it is hardly too much to assume that the hypothesis, if stated in full, would amount to this: that the book is a compilation, made at a subsequent time, of traditions, written or oral, relating to the apostolic age; a compilation made in good faith indeed, but in a very inartificial and uncritical manner; without that sifting of facts, or modification of the writer's materials, which would be requisite to render it trustworthy. The question arises, then, whether this supposition is compatible with the form and character of the book.

Now if the view I have been taking of its character and purpose is borne out by the considerations adduced in its support, this question has been already decided in the negative. I have affirmed that the writer had a purpose, which he has distinctly announced and consistently followed out. He must have had, then, too clear a conception of his work to be the mere compiler which the supposition would make him. A compiler, in a certain sense, every historian of matters beyond his personal experience must be. Thucydides and Tacitus and Gibbon and Macaulay are, in this sense, compilers; but they sifted their materials, chose such as they judged trustworthy and relevant, and moulded them in their own minds and clothed them with their own language, retaining the original form only when some special reason made it appropriate. In this sense the author of the Acts of the Apostles was a compiler, but surely in no other. Let any one read carefully the opening verses of our third Gospel, and say whether the man who wrote them was likely to put together his materials in the rude, inartificial way attributed to him.

Beside, does the book present the motley appearance, has it the variety of style, whether of thinking or writing, which, on such a supposition, it would surely possess? Has any critical analysis been successful in resolving into its constituent parts? It has been said, indeed, that the early chapters bear a strong impression of the earlier or Judaic form of Christianity; but I apprehend that the difference, if any, arises simply from their containing the history of the Judaic period of the infant church, not from the record being conceived in a more Judaic spirit, or being the product of a mind of more Judaic cast.

The indications, pointed out by Mr. Wallace in the papers some time since referred to, of the different authorship of the parts into which he proposed to divide the narrative, appear to

me very trivial, and altogether insufficient to sustain his hypothesis (C. R. 2nd series, IV. 81 seq., 186 seq.). That hypothesis is indeed very different from the one against which I am now contending, which supposes the compilation to be of a later date, but it accords with it in ascribing different parts of the book to different authors; and as that is the point now under consideration, a brief notice of Mr. Wallace's arguments will hardly be out of place.

They are of two kinds; those derived from the structure of the narrative, and those resting upon peculiarities of expression.

Of the first kind he adduces three. The absence of any uniformity of design is the principal one; but this has been already considered. The second is, that though the seven deacons are mentioned, the acts of only two are recorded, shewing, he thinks, that that portion of the book was left incomplete: and the third is, that the title, "*Acts of the Apostles*," is strictly applicable only to the first eight chapters, to which, consequently, they must have originally belonged, and which must have therefore been a separate work. In reply to this, it is enough to say that an enumeration of all the persons appointed to an office does not at all imply an intention to give a separate history of each, and that there is no proof that the existing title was given by the author either to the book as a whole or any part of it. It may not be amiss to notice, too, that usually the title is not "*The Acts of the Apostles*" (*αἱ πράξεις*), but "*Acts*" (*πραξεις*), without the article.* Beside, the title would be inappropriate even to the first eight chapters, to which Mr. Wallace supposed it to refer; for this portion contains the acts of two of the deacons, and was designed, according to Mr. Wallace, to contain the acts of all the seven.

The second class, those resting on peculiarities of expression, are thought to constitute marks of distinction either between the earlier part of the book and the Gospel of Luke, or between the earlier and the later portion of the Acts.

The discrepancies between the earlier part of the Acts and the third Gospel consist of a different order of enumeration of the twelve (comp. Luke vi. 13, &c.; Acts i. 13), a different manner of mentioning Annas and Caiaphas (Luke iii. 2; Acts iv. 6), and an apparent difference as to the time of the ascension (Luke xxiv. 13, 33, 50, &c.; Acts i. 3, &c.). The first alleged discrepancy seems to rest on the puerile supposition that a writer must needs always enumerate the names of the apostles in one stereotyped order; the second discrepancy is of little moment if it exists, but a comparison of the passages in the original makes its very existence questionable; and the last assumes, what is by no means clear, that all the events mentioned in ch. xxiv. of the

* See Griesbach in loco.

third Gospel, are represented as occurring on the same day as the resurrection. Had there been two different traditions of the time of the ascension, one making it occur on the day of the resurrection, the other forty days after, and had these different traditions been both recorded in the New Testament, they could hardly have been so soon reconciled as they must have been without difference or dispute; for the early church was harmonious in fixing the interval at forty days.*

The discrepancies between the different portions into which Mr. Wallace divides the book are these: that in one part the name Saul is used, in the other Paul; that in one part Barnabas is named before Saul, in the other Saul, or rather Paul, usually takes precedence; though it is admitted that this latter order is not uniformly observed; that the statement in viii. 4 is repeated with enlargement in xi. 19, and that, consequently, these passages were not improbably written by different hands; and lastly, that the use of the more complete expression, "disciples of the Lord" (ix. 1), in place of the briefer form, "disciples," is an indication that the narrative was here taken up by a fresh writer.

Perhaps I ought to add to these reasons Mr. Wallace's remark that, in the first eight chapters, the apostles are represented as acting quite independently of the church, but always as a body; whereas, in the subsequent part, they act less in a body, and commonly in conjunction with the great body of believers, "the apostles and brethren." Mr. Wallace makes this difference the chief ground of his assertion, that the title, "*Acts of the Apostles,*" is only applicable to the first eight chapters, which, therefore, he thinks must have been a separate work.

Now surely it is more reasonable to refer these changes of phraseology to a corresponding variation in the circumstances recorded, rather than to a change of authors. If Saul is called by his original Hebrew name while acting his part as a Jew or among Jews, and by his Roman name, Paulus, when entering on a wider sphere of action, where anything indicative of a connection with Rome would inspire deference; is it not likely that the change of designation in the narrative is a simple consequence of the change in the practice of the apostle and his companions?†

* Upon Mr. Wallace's hypothesis that the first chapters of the Acts were written by the apostle Matthew, but that the book was continued and edited by Luke, we must suppose that Luke, though aware of Matthew's statement, deliberately rejected it, notwithstanding that it related to a plain question of fact, about which Matthew, an apostle and eye-witness, could hardly be mistaken. Luke must, in that case, have held the authority of his brother evangelist very cheap indeed.

† It is remarkable that the name Paulus, one of the most illustrious names in Roman history, is first given to the apostle in relating the events connected with the proconsul Sergius Paulus; and this has naturally led to the conjecture that it was then first given to him or assumed by him. Jerome supposes it was done in commemoration of the proconsul's conversion. A more natural explanation would be, that the citizenship had been acquired by one of Paul's ances-

So, too, with reference to the order of the names Barnabas and Saul (or Paul), is it not natural that while Barnabas was the more important personage he should be named first; but that when he had subsided into an inferior position, the reverse order should be employed? In fact, Mr. Wallace concedes that the order is in some instances varied for a special reason in the nature of the events related (C. R. 2nd series, IV. 85). And again, the more divided action of the apostles was the necessary consequence of their more extended sphere of action; and the admission of the "brethren" to a share in their deliberations was the natural result of the growth of the church in knowledge and experience. Such variations in the historian's language follow of course from the variations in the events which form the subject of his history.

The other arguments of Mr. Wallace, the repetition of the expressions in cli. viii. 4 and xi. 19, and the use of the enlarged phrase "disciples of the Lord," rest on too trivial a basis to be worth further notice; the first, if it were worth anything, would rather argue identity than diversity of authorship; and the second would authorize us to ascribe Mr. Wallace's own papers to different hands, because he has, in one place (p. 261), substituted the fuller title of "the Acts of the Apostles" for his usual shorter expression, "the book of Acts."

It may be thought that, in this examination of Mr. Wallace's arguments, I have made a needless digression, inasmuch as the hypothesis against which I am contending is altogether different from his, and the refutation of one by no means implies a sufficient answer to the other. But the two have this in common, that they ascribe different portions of the book to different writers; and it is against this common feature that I am now contending. My argument is, that the form and character of the book give no countenance to the hypothesis; and that if a man of Mr. Wallace's pursuits and attainments has failed in the attempt to make out the contrary, it is a fair inference that the form of the book affords no countenance to the notion of divided authorship.

Leaving, however, all further consideration of any general theory of mere compilation, I proceed to consider the special case of the passages in which the writer speaks in the first person, and thus connects himself with the events which he records. These, it is suggested, may be extracts from a journal of one of Paul's companions, incorporated, without notice, but in perfect simplicity and good faith, by the author of the book in its pre-

tors (he was himself free by birth) through the interest of one of the family of the Pauli; and that consequently the family had adopted the name Paulus, agreeably to the usual practice when provincials obtained the citizenship (Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* s. v. *Nomen*). This, too, would account for the apparently easy introduction of Paul and Barnabas to the proconsul's friendly notice.

sent form. And in support of this, it is observed that the extracts relate almost wholly to the sea voyages of the apostle.

First of all we have to determine, as nearly as possible, which are the portions in question. They are these: chap. xvi. 9 or 10—40,* giving an account of part of Paul's second missionary tour, from Troas to Philippi inclusive; ch. xx. 4 to xxi. 17, containing the account of Paul's journey (chiefly by sea) from Philippi to Jerusalem; and ch. xxvii. xxviii., giving an account of his being taken as a prisoner from Cæsarea to Rome, the greater part of this route also being by sea.

Now the suggestion that these portions are extracts, is on the face of it open to serious objection. They are not marked by any peculiarities of style which distinguish them from the rest of the book. From their minuteness, and from their relating to times and countries distant from each other, the journal from which they were taken must have been a large and important work; and it is difficult to believe that such a work from a companion of Paul would have been left to perish, without so much as a hint of its existence. Surely the affectionate reverence of the early church would not have failed to preserve something more than unacknowledged extracts from so precious a document? The remark that the extracts relate to sea voyages is of little importance or relevancy. The journal was not a mere sea journal, for the extracts include transactions at Philippi, Cæsarea and Jerusalem; and the writer was not a seaman, but a coadjutor of Paul in his missionary work (ch. xvi. 10, 13).

But this is not all. These extracts were inserted without notice, and in such a way as to identify the author of the compilation in which they were inserted with the author of the journal, and thus to give to the compilation itself the appearance of an earlier date than it could justly claim; and this we are told was done unconsciously and in perfect good faith; and that it is quite in keeping with the simple and inartificial character of these early writings. "Simple" and "inartificial," are terms altogether too mild to describe adequately such egregious carelessness or stupidity. A writer inserts, and that repeatedly, passages which make him necessarily appear to have belonged to a bygone generation and a different locality, and this with a perfect unconsciousness of what he was about; and yet, incredibly stupid or careless as he must have been, he has produced a work which has been held in reverence for ages, and been examined and commented on by scholars of various periods and nations, without the blunder being so much as suspected, till some seventeen or eighteen centuries have passed away.

* It is not easy, on this extract hypothesis, to determine where the supposed extracts begin and end. That the first begins at xvi. 9 or 10, may seem clear, but it is not so clear whether it extends beyond ver. 18. Again, the second and third extracts may be only parts of one very long one, which includes not only these portions, but the intermediate part of the book.

If the writer were so grossly ignorant or careless, it would be almost inevitable that the insertion would be so clumsily managed, that the points of junction would be very marked. The boundaries of such coarse patches must needs be plain; there would be contradictions or gaps or repetitions, or some other of the many marks of such poor workmanship. But is it so? Can the utmost skill of a practised hand more thoroughly conceal the junction of the works of different writers? Take the following passage, which must include a part of the extract, if extract there be, and of the work in which it is inserted (ch. xvi. 6—11): "*And they, passing by Mysia, came down to Troas. And a vision appeared to Paul in the night; There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, 'Come over into Macedonia and help us.'* And after he had seen the vision, immediately *we endeavoured* to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord *had called us* for to preach the gospel unto them. Therefore, loosing from Troas, *we came* with a straight course to Samothracia, and the next day to Neapolis; and from thence to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony: and *we were* in that city abiding certain days." I have pointed out by italics the words which shew that it is within the limits of this passage, if anywhere, that the junction is to be found. Yet what trace of it can we perceive? So, again, with the junction at the close of the extract, whether it be fixed at the 18th or the 40th verse. Again with the second extract: "And after the uproar was ceased, *Paul* called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when *he had gone* over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, *he came* into Greece, and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as *he was about to sail* to Syria, *he determined to return* through Macedonia. And *there accompanied him* as far as Asia, Sopater [the son of Pyrrhus] of Berea; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus. These going before, *tarried for us* at Troas" (ch. xx. 1—5). Now can we suppose that a writer who could with such exquisite skill inlay his own narrative with extracts from another, was unconscious that, in this very perfection of authorcraft, he was identifying himself with the writer from whom he was thus freely borrowing?

Besides, whenever he has incorporated the words of another in his narrative, and the nature of his work obliged him to do so continually, he has elsewhere always accurately distinguished them. The speeches of Peter, Stephen, Paul; the conversations of Peter with Ananias and Cornelius, and of Philip with Simon of Samaria and the Ethiopian; the letters of the council of Jerusalem to the Gentile churches, and of Claudius Lysias to Felix, —all are carefully distinguished from the words of the writer in whose narrative they are recorded. Are we to suppose, then,

that in regard to these extracts, and to these alone, he must have shewn such glaring incapacity?

Now contrast with all these difficulties, the natural, simple hypothesis, so long and undoubtedly accepted, that these passages are not extracts, but parts of one continuous narrative; that the author of the book and companion of the apostle are one and the same person.

There are three forms in which a writer who was a companion of the person whose history he is recording, during a part only of the period which his account comprehends; and a participator in some, not all, of the events which he records, may frame his narrative. If desirous to give prominence to the fact of his presence or participation, he would distinctly notify it. If, on the other hand, he was anxious to conceal it, he would avoid all indication of it by keeping carefully to the third person. Both of these forms would be adopted under the influence of a conscious purpose; but in the absence of such purpose he would simply indicate his participation by the use of the first person, recording the facts which he remembered, just as they lay before him in the storehouse of his memory, without effort, almost without consciousness. And it is to be observed, that this use of the first person would be limited to the transactions in which he was personally included; while of others of which he was an eye-witness, not an actor, he would speak in the third person.*

Now the narrative of which we are speaking is of the third kind; that is, the narrative of one who writes naturally, and without any thought either of putting his presence and participation forward, or of concealing them; but writing, in this respect, unconsciously. In noting what was done by, or what happened to, the company of which he was one, he uses "we" and "us;" in what concerns others only, he speaks of "Paul" or "Silas," of "him" or "them." From this difference it is not always easy to determine where the writer speaks as an eye-witness. I have noticed already that, on the extract hypothesis, it is not easy to determine where the extracts begin and end; there is a similar but not an equal difficulty in determining where the writer joined company with the apostle and where he left him.

On the first occasion, it is indeed clear enough. Luke (or the writer whoever he might be) joined Paul at Troas, and did not

* I have noticed that it is thought to support the extract hypothesis, that the use of the first person occurs chiefly in relation of sea voyages. This is easily accounted for. The events related are more likely to affect the whole company and therefore to include the writer. Events occurring on shore are less likely to affect the whole company. Hence in the supposed extracts there are long passages without an expression in the first person, e.g. (probably) xvi. 18—40; certainly xx. 16—38. So that we cannot by any means be sure that the extract ends when the first person is disused, and therefore cannot surely infer that it is limited to sea voyages. Even if xx. 4—xxi. 17 be an extract, where can it be shewn clearly to end? And if, as would be not unlikely, it included ch. xxii. seq. what becomes of the assertion about sea voyages?

accompany him beyond Philippi. On the second occasion, he joined him at Philippi and accompanied him to Jerusalem. Whether he continued with him at Jerusalem and accompanied or followed him to Cæsarea, is not so clear. My own conviction is that he did. There are some picturesque features in the narrative which, I think, shew that Luke was either present or had his account directly from those who were. Take, for instance, the account of Paul's danger and rescue from the mob at Jerusalem. "*And all the city was moved, and the people ran together: and they took Paul and drew him out of the temple, and the doors were shut. And as they were about to kill him, tidings came up (ἀνέβη) to the chief captain of the band that all Jerusalem was in an uproar. Who immediately took soldiers and centurions and ran down unto them; and when they saw the chief captain and the soldiers, they left beating of Paul. . . . And when he came upon the stairs, so it was, that he was borne of the soldiers for the violence of the people. . . . And when he had given him licence, Paul stood on the stairs and beckoned with the hand unto the people: and when there was made a great silence he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue, saying . . . And when they heard that he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue, they kept the more silence*" (xxi. 30—xxii. 2). I have marked with italics the particular parts of the narrative which indicate that the writer was present, or, at least, that the account was immediately derived from those who were.*

And so with other parts of the narrative of Paul's imprisonment: the discovery of his citizenship by the chief captain (xxii. 24—29); the examination before the Jewish council (xxii. 30—xxiii. 10); the interview of Paul's sister's son with the chief captain (xxiii. 16—22); the particular account of the escort and the night journey (ib. 23—33); the two appearances of Paul before Festus (xxv. and xxvi.): all these appear to me the work of one on the spot to see or learn, and interested to record, the minutest particulars.

I have stated my conviction that the writer was with Paul during his imprisonment at Jerusalem and Cæsarea.† This seems to me to be the natural conclusion from the fact that he was plainly with him at its commencement and at its close, and from the marks which have been just pointed out that the narrative is by an eye-witness. If so, there are two periods in which he was the apostle's companion. If we suppose him to have left the apostle during his two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea by Felix (to which it may be thought that the silence of the narrative as to the

* It is to be borne in mind that Jerusalem was destroyed a very few years after Paul's visit to it; and the traces of localities would be in many cases obliterated.

† It is noticed (ch. xxiv. 23) that Paul had some "of his own people" (οἱ ἱδίοι) with him at Cæsarea.

events of that interval gives countenance), the periods of companionship will be three, but they will include a shorter time.

There is one more consideration which supports the belief that the supposed extracts are really original portions of the book. If, as we suppose, the writer remained behind at Philippi, it is quite natural that he should rejoin the apostle at the same place, when he subsequently passed through it; and, moreover, his remaining is quite consistent with the apostle's known practice of sending or leaving some of his companions to take charge of those churches to which he could not personally attend (2 Cor. vii. 6—8, viii. 6, 16—19; 1 Thess. iii. 1—6; 1 Tim. i. 3, &c.; 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. i. 5). In the very journey of which we are speaking, Silas and Timotheus were left behind at Berea (xvii. 14, 15, xviii. 5). But that of two unconnected extracts, the second should commence with the locality where the first had ended, is, to say the least, somewhat remarkable. There is an obvious reason for the coincidence on the first supposition, which there is not on the second.

I think, then, we may affirm without hesitation that the passages are not extracts, but parts of one continuous narrative; that the author of the book and the companion of the apostle are one and the same person. And if so, surely we can have no hesitation in ascribing the work to Luke.

LIST OF THE PUBLISHED WRITINGS OF THE LATE REV. EDWARD TAGART, F.S.A., F.L.S.

MR. TAGART was not an habitual or very frequent writer for the press, and when he did break through the reserve which was his practice, it was, if not in deference to the wishes of others, to give expression to some strong and settled conviction of his mind. The list of his writings will not therefore carry us through any very wide range of subjects; but they present to our view some volumes on topics of no mean importance, and many smaller publications illustrative of the religious views to which he clung with a strong persuasion of their truth and value.

His first appearance as an author was in the Religious Service on the occasion of his settlement, in 1825, at Norwich. To that he contributed the Reply to the Address spoken on behalf of the congregation to the new Pastor by Mr. Edward Taylor.

In 1832, he printed two excellent sermons, preached at York-Street chapel, on the "Claims of Unitarian Christianity to the respectful Consideration of the Reflecting Public." Though in these discourses the preacher travels over many topics, they are selected with judgment and handled with power, and the

result is an uniformity of impression on the reader's mind in harmony with the conclusions of the writer.

His next appearance as an author was as a writer of biography —“A Memoir of the late Captain Peter Heywood, R.N., with Extracts from his Diaries and Correspondence.” (London, 1832, pp. 332.) Of this amiable but unfortunate man his personal knowledge was small, being limited to the closing period of his life, and when suffering from broken health. Nevertheless, the narrative is one of continuous interest, is clear and graphic in its details, and is written with much warmth of feeling. The story of Heywood's implication in the mutiny of the *Bounty*, of his trial, condemnation, pardon, his re-entrance on the naval service and subsequent professional life, are now familiar to the public, and need not be dwelt on by us. As, however, the volume has long been out of print, we will extract the passage in which Captain Heywood's religious sentiments are described, and mention is made of the circumstances which gave Mr. Tagart a feeling of personal interest in him:

“He was in religious sentiment strictly a Unitarian. Though he rarely made religion the topic of his conversation, because, perhaps, he met with few who sympathized in his feelings on that most interesting and important of all subjects; and though he had a great objection to personal controversy and discussion, knowing how soon the cloud and storm of the temper intervene to darken the mild light of the understanding, he never concealed his sentiments, nor hesitated, on proper occasions, to avow them. It is worthy of more serious observation that his views were Unitarian, because they were the result of his own reading and reflection, under circumstances in which no sectarian or party feeling, no ties of worldly interest or family connexion, nor any of the ordinary influences of social life, could operate to check the free exercises of his mind. In the retirement of his cabin, in the solitude of the ocean, in the silence of night, he read and thought. Early and sad experience of life had given to all his reflections a serious cast; and while it lessened his taste for the ordinary pleasures of the world, it contributed so to elevate and purify his mind as to enable him to view all objects through a clear atmosphere, and to look down upon ‘all the kingdoms of the world,’ and judge of the true ‘glory of them.’ It was thus, and in this tone, that he adopted those views of scriptural truth which, however commonly denounced by the leaders of public opinion, have seemed just to some of the wisest and best of the human race, and which in our own country have been endeared to many by the approbation of a Locke, a Lardner, a Milton, a Newcome, and a Law.

“Of Unitarians, as a sect, Captain Heywood knew little or nothing. But in the latter part of his life, as his religious views became known to some of his friends, he was led to attend the chapel in York Street, St. James's Square; and entirely approving the service, he became a regular attendant, as far as his health would permit, on public Unitarian worship in that place. This continued for about two years, and was the origin of an intercourse between the subject and author of this memoir, most highly valued by the latter, who little knew the deep

interest attached to Captain Heywood's character and history, until he became a witness of the sufferings which preceded his removal from this scene.—Pp. 318—320.

Mr. Tagart commemorated in his next publication the opening of the chapel in Little Portland Street, the subject of his sermon being, "The Rise and Progress of Unitarian Christianity an Earnest of its Future Triumph." It is a sequel to the sermons previously printed, and has their characteristic merits.

In 1835, he published a sermon occasioned by the profession of Unitarian Christianity by Rev. J. Blanco White, but of its merits we are not able to speak.

In 1837, appeared, in a small duodecimo volume, "Remarks on Mathematical or Demonstrative Reasoning; its Connexion with Logic and its Application to Science, Physical and Metaphysical, with reference to some recent Publications." The history of this volume explains its defects. It was commenced as an article of review, but, growing beyond the limits originally contemplated, was published in a separate form. The original design gave to the execution of the work a controversial tone scarcely suitable to its subject. The writers criticised by Mr. Tagart are Dugald Stewart, Mackintosh, Mill, Playfair and Austin. The dedication has inscribed on it the name of the author's tutor in philosophy and his much-valued friend, Rev. William Turner. Recalling the happy days he passed at York College, he says, "In the metaphysical as well as theological department of that institution, we were taught to study with care and candour the best works, not to cavil and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, but to weigh and consider."

In 1842, in common with many other English Unitarian ministers, he published a "Tribute to the Memory of the Rev. William Ellery Channing, D.D."

In 1843, he published a useful and very interesting volume of ecclesiastical history, entitled, "Sketches of the Lives and Characters of the leading Reformers of the Sixteenth Century." The subjects of these Sketches are Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Socinus, Cranmer and Knox. The lives and writings of these distinguished Reformers bring into view the essential principles of Protestantism, and furnish to the Unitarian, the Protestant of Protestants, good vantage ground. On this Mr. Tagart planted his feet firmly, and took a position not easily shaken. The volume was received with favour by the public, and has long been scarce. The critics noticed it with the scanty and reluctant praise with which at the best they are wont to treat writings reputedly heretical. It is to be regretted that Mr. Tagart was not induced to prosecute his inquiries into this branch of ecclesiastical history. At one time he contemplated doing so.

In 1844, he drew up "Truths from Scripture," designed as a brief view of Unitarian Christianity in the language of Scripture.

In the same year he reprinted from the pages of this Magazine an able and very interesting article of review on Sir John Bowring's *Memoirs of Bentham*, in which he clearly traces the large obligations of the political philosopher to Dr. Priestley.

About the same time he printed, but (we believe) did not publish, the Address delivered to his flock on their presentation to him of some memorial Plate (July 9, 1844). As we have so largely used this autobiographical Address, we need not further describe it.

In 1846, he preached and published a felicitous and eloquent discourse, the subject of which was suggested by the discovery, on the 23rd of September in that year, of the new planet, distant from the sun more than three millions of miles, and containing a mass equal to that of our earth multiplied by 230. The passage that follows will be read with pleasure:

"How truly and in how high a sense science is the handmaid of religion! All knowledge is eminently subservient to a rational piety. True wisdom leads to love—the love at once of that Being who has given good gifts unto men, and of those whom he has so eminently distinguished and endowed; for whom he has by nature, and by the more distinct and emphatic provision of the Gospel, shewn so much concern, giving us 'the earnest of the spirit of adoption.' Everything that strengthens our acquaintance with nature, every enlargement of the boundaries of human intelligence, every new treasure that enriches the archives of science, appears to me in the same proportion to enhance our ideas of the great Creator, to make our adoration and service more worthy of his perfections. The peasant, when from the mountain top 'he beholds the sun rise up and bathe the world in light,' may feel a gratitude more lively, a devotion more fervent, than one who has received ampler instruction, and can tell far more of the scientific relations between the orb which warms him and the earth on which he treads. Worldly passions, interests and pursuits may have dulled the devotional sentiments and chilled the human sympathies of the latter; may have left the heart cold, and the knowledge barren, and dead within him; but if there be any tendencies to devotion within,—if, with the pursuits of science, a spirit of tenderness and humanity has been maintained and cherished, the tribute of the intelligent spirit to the Almighty Creator and Ruler must be proportionably exalted and proportionably worthy." Pp. 12, 13.

Mr. Tagart occasionally, but not frequently, sent contributions to our periodical works, and some of these he reprinted,—viz., one or two letters to the Editor of the *Christian Teacher*, in reply to some severe strictures on the books and tracts issued by the Unitarian Association; a letter to Dr. William Carpenter on the import of the Christian name, in which, in opposition to some opinions advanced by that gentleman in the *Inquirer*, he gives his reasons for declining to extend the Christian name to those who reject the supernatural portions of the New Testament.

Of Mr. Tagart's minor publications, one only remains to be mentioned—"Two Discourses on the History of the Authorized Version of the Bible and the Expediency of its Revision." These were preached and published in the autumn of 1856, when many circumstances had conspired to draw public attention to the important subject, in which Mr. Tagart always took an intelligent and lively interest, of a revised translation of the Bible. As the last published discourses of Mr. Tagart, they will, independently of their sterling merits, be read with deep interest, and they are in subject and temper in harmony with all the purposes to which he gave his talents and influence.

The most elaborate of Mr. Tagart's writings was a volume published in 1855, entitled, "Locke's Writings and Philosophy historically considered, and vindicated from the Charge of contributing to the Scepticism of Hume." He has himself well explained the motives which led him to prepare this volume for the press, and the plan which he has followed in its composition :

"Brought up in a school in which Locke was the object of traditional veneration,—a veneration heightened and justified by reading, reflection, and experience,—I have seen with mingled astonishment and pain the attempts recently made to depose the master from his seat of honour, among those from whom better things were to be expected."

He designed the book to be a plea for English philosophy and its great masters.

"It consists of two parts. The first is a vindication of Locke from prevalent misrepresentations, and especially from the charge of encouraging scepticism in religion and morals, shewing, by a somewhat careful examination of Hume's metaphysical writings, that Hume neither built nor affected to build on any principles peculiar to Locke, and placing Locke in just relation to Descartes, Berkeley, Gassendi, and Leibnitz. The second contains a view of the progress of English philosophy, properly so called, from Bacon, through Hobbes, Locke, and Hartley, to more modern thinkers, such as Bentham, Mill, and Austin. It aspires to give such a view of the contents of the 'Essay on the Human Understanding' as may facilitate the profitable study of it, and give to the reader a clear perception of its excellencies and defects."

Thus Mr. Tagart sums up the results of his investigation of the writings of the great English philosopher :

"We have now seen that in the philosophy of the mind, of government, of education, and of the connection between natural and revealed religion, Locke stands far above all his predecessors after the revival of letters; and further, that he prepared the way for whatever additions have been made since his day to our knowledge of the human mind, of the principles of moral and political philosophy, and to the rational criticism of the Scriptures. We have shewn what are his real merits, and his chief defects; and this is essential, not only to the just appreciation of the admirable philosopher himself, but, what is of more importance, to an estimate of the present condition of the science of mind

and morals, and to any well-founded expectations of the progress of mankind in self-knowledge, which is the instrument of self-government and improvement, and in the virtues and habits which are the best security for social happiness. He therefore is scarcely worthy of the name of Englishman,—he can have no proper sense of the value of the literature and institutions of his country, who does not assign to Locke a place in the first rank among the instructors and benefactors of his species. There Barry has placed him, conspicuous among his great compeers, in that admirable but little estimated production of England's art—the large picture of Elysium, which adorns the room of the Society of Arts in the Adelphi, a picture which renders heaven inviting by the noble society which it assembles, and which awakens the rapture of confidence and hope in connection with the assurance of the poet—

‘Yet there the soul shall enter which hath earned
That privilege by virtue.’”

“One great and inestimable advantage the disciple of Bacon, Locke, and Hartley must enjoy over the pupils of every other school. A philosophy, intelligible, consistent, and practical, will supply him with a number of rules available for constant self-regulation, improvement, and happiness. Sympathy with the pure and lofty spirit of the masters, and the constant study of their works, will mould the temper to a like heavenly frame. Through the purification of the heart the understanding will be cleared. No fumes of prejudice and passion, of envy or malignity, will rise to dim the eye of the mind. Curiosity, stimulated by the desire of good, will issue in truth and the attainment of useful knowledge. All that is solid and instructive in science, all that is sublime and beautiful in the order of nature, graceful and sweet in poetry and the expression of human sentiment, all that is delicate, tender, consoling and elevating in common life and the instruction of Scripture, will mix with it and vanish into it, to enhance the radiance of the glory of God. Teaching us that benevolence is the fountain and happiness the end of universal being, by attracting to itself all our pleasures, and by softening, if not subduing, all our pains, such philosophy will place us among the men who

‘With God himself
Hold converse; grow familiar, day by day,
With his conceptions; act upon his plan,
And form to his the relish of our souls.’

Then, in the exquisite language of Milton:

‘How charming is divine Philosophy!
Not harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose,
But musical as is Apollo's lute,
And a perpetual feast of nectar'd sweets,
Where no crude surfeit reigns.’”

In undertaking the defence of the philosophy of Locke, Mr. Tagart was conscious that he was opposing himself to the now fashionable, but scarcely philosophical, doctrine of innate ideas—a doctrine which has, in varied phraseology, diffused itself over the domain of theology as well as philosophy, and introduced into both confusion and mysticism. To the disciples of the school of Coleridge, the names of Locke and Paley are an abomination, and little grace or tolerance is deemed due to those

who stand forth in their defence. The critical treatment of Mr. Tagart's work proved no exception to this remark. It was handled with much severity, and with marked incivility in one quarter in which at least it might have been expected that an unfavourable verdict would have been pronounced with gentleness and some reserve. Mr. Tagart bore the attacks of the critic with admirable temper. He was sustained not only by his firm reliance on the philosophy of Locke, but by the expressed approbation and sympathy of some judges of unquestionable ability. Nothing gratified him more than to know that his book was approved by Mr. Hallam. From a note written by that distinguished man, and bearing date, "24, Wilton Crescent, Nov. 25, 1857," we have with some labour deciphered (the manuscript in badness surpasses Parr's and Bentham's) the following lines :

"I beg you to accept my best thanks for your kind present of your volume on Locke's Philosophy, which I have read with great pleasure. And I think you have fully examined the main points. I think it will have the effect of restoring Locke to the place he ought to take in the estimation of his country, but which has been in some measure taken from him."

TRUST.

ALL ye that mourn and weep,
 And in the heart, down deep,
 Some secret sorrow keep,
 Be patient 'neath the trial,
 And through the cloud shall beam God's smile ;
 For, like the hushing of the breeze's sigh,
 A voice soft stealeth from the starry sky,
 As music floats on air, and whispers nigh,
 God marketh e'en the sparrow's fall,
 His providence is over all.

All ye that, sad and lone,
 Count years by joys long flown,
 And friends by graves grass-grown,
 Leave, leave the Past to God,
 As those that sleep beneath the sod ;
 And strengthened into perfect faith by woe,
 Go, say to those who 'neath Despair crouch low,
 Who strain their eyes for Death, and weep to go,
 God marketh e'en the sparrow's fall,
 His providence is over all.

All ye who would fulfil,
 The Father's loving will,
 Whose hearts with pity thrill
 Towards the fall'n and stray,
 Though at life's noon ye are called away,
 Fear not; God worketh as none other can;
 His truth sufficeth in itself for man,
 His love the space 'twixt earth and heaven doth span
 He marketh e'en the sparrow's fall,
 His providence is over all.

All ye whose hearts seem broke,
 As passive 'neath the stroke,
 With agony unspoke,
 Ye stand beside the grave
 Of one ye loved and could not save,
 And gaze up speechless to the smiling sky,
 Repining not, but wishing ye might die,
 Be comforted; the grave to heaven is very nigh.
 God marketh e'en the sparrow's fall,
 His providence is over all.

All ye that basked awhile
 'Neath Fortune's sunny smile,
 Then in the hour of trial
 Were left on earth's drear wold
 To shiver in the rain and cold;
 Faint not, since in the storm God's love is shewn,
 For on it angels hover round unknown;
 God will not leave his little ones alone;
 He marketh e'en the sparrow's fall,
 His providence is over all.

Alas! we all know care,
 Weakness that none would spare,
 As sorrows none may share;
 The loss of those loved best,
 Hearts vacant as the ravished nest;
 Yet still we may look up with trustful eye,
 Since Sorrow's Love disguised, and Peace stands nigh,
 And through Grief's deepening gloom a voice doth cry,
 God marketh e'en the sparrow's fall,
 His providence is over all.

Dorchester.

A. E. B.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Charles I. in 1646. Letters of King Charles the First to Queen Henrietta Maria. Edited by John Bruce, Esq., F.S.A. Printed for the Camden Society.

THE history of this publication is as curious as, if genuine (of which the sagacious editor entertains no doubt), its substance is important. Early in 1855, Mr. Joseph Conway Witton, of Bath, purchased from a dealer in curiosities a volume in MS. of letters chiefly written by Charles I. to his Queen in 1646. Finding through *Notes and Queries* that the existence of such letters was unknown to persons conversant with the secret history of that period, Mr. Witton, at the suggestion of the editor, sent the volume for inspection. The result was a very strong impression of the genuineness of the letters, and with Mr. Witton's consent they are published by the Camden Society.

At various periods letters of Charles I. have found their way into print, and they have generally tended to lower his political character. It is thought not improbable that these letters were suppressed in 1690, when a bookseller designed to print certain letters which had passed between Charles and his Queen, and the suppression was effected by the influence of Bishop Sprat and Lord Rochester.

Even to our own days there have been found apologists both for Charles and his Queen, not mere blind Churchmen, ready to believe or disbelieve according to their wishes, but men who professed to found their opinions on historical documents. Mr. Isaac Disraeli was the least scrupulous among the later apologists of Charles. In that ingenious romance which he was pleased to entitle "*Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles I.*" (which the University of Oxford so gratefully appreciated as to confer upon its author the title of D.C.L. and style him *optimi regis optimus defensor*), there is a long and elaborate chapter devoted to "the influence of the Queen on the King's conduct" (Vol. I. ch. xxxii.), in which the idea that Charles weakly gave way to the imperious temper of Henrietta Maria is attempted to be proved a "popular delusion, raised for party purposes, and perpetuated by the echoes of writers who consult for their use what is convenient rather than what is just." The volume now for the first time published confirms all that has been hitherto said of the Queen's fatal influence over Charles. He was "bound hand and foot by promises to her, and was restricted from acting without her consent." These letters shew how obediently he fulfilled his promises to her, though they involved unfaithfulness alike to friends and foes. When, by the advice of the French ambassadors, he gave way to the establishment of Presbyterian government for three years, and yielded the government of the militia for ten,—concessions that would probably have saved his life and throne,—the Queen, to whom he referred his intended answer, stopped it, and treated her feeble-minded husband with ill-concealed contempt. The King submitted, withdrew his intended answer, and tried once more to temporize with the Parliament. That body, finding itself, with uncontrolled power in its hands, trifled with, made the King a prisoner and prepared for the

last act. As Mr. Bruce observes, one of the Queen's letters here printed exemplifies the fatal influence which Henrietta Maria possessed, and the uncivil way in which it was too often exercised.

That Charles the First was tenderly attached to Henrietta Maria is certain. That she ever returned his love in sincerity is not so clearly proved. That she respected either the memory of her husband, whom his admirers termed a martyr, or her own reputation, is made more than doubtful by the particulars of her widowed life in Paris.

We cannot give in fewer or plainer words the important bearing on historical inquiries of this volume, than by quoting the editor's concluding introductory remarks :

"The great lesson to be deduced from the following book is, that they who set themselves in opposition to Charles I. in his lifetime judged accurately of his character, and of the dangers to which the country was exposed under his government. To examine this matter fully would lead us too far a-field, but we will mention three particulars in which these letters speak distinctly.

"Charles's opponents alleged that, inheriting the weakness of his father, and like him continually clinging to some stronger nature for guidance and support, he selected for favourites and ministers persons whose opinions and course of conduct were perversely opposed to the wishes and feelings of the English people. In proof they cited the extravagant folly of Buckingham, the absolutism of Strafford, the anti-protestantism of Laud, and summed up all by referring to the unmanly submission which Charles yielded to his queen, not merely in his private affairs but in those also of his kingdom and government. The letters now printed prove the accuracy of these allegations in the instance of Henrietta Maria. Un-English in her tastes and notions, separated from the people by her religion, and never able to form the slightest idea of the depth and fervour of their opinions, it is clear from the letters before us that the fortunes of England were laid with most abject humility at the feet of this imperious lady.

"Charles's opponents alleged again, that, whilst his people feared nothing so much as a return to the dominion of Rome, he outraged the popular feeling, and facilitated that dreaded return, by giving his patronage to anti-protestant innovators, who dressed up the national church as a victim ready to be sacrificed to her great adversary; they added that he protected and encouraged Roman Catholics in defiance of the law, and shewed direct discouragement, not only to Protestants at home, and to foreign Protestants, but generally to that Protestant cause which it had been the policy and the glory of England, under queen Elizabeth, to uphold. The letters before us confirm the accuracy of this charge. They prove that Charles was directly bent upon over-riding the opinions of his people, and had so little notion of the dignity of his position as the king of an independent country, that he was ready, like another John, to abase himself, and tarnish the honour of the nation, by receiving again his forfeited crown from the hands of the pope.

"Another of their allegations was that Charles was personally untrustworthy; that in his concessions and agreements there was ever some reservation, some quibble, some jesuitical verbal distinction, contrived before hand to deceive those who confided in him. This was asserted to be a part of his character so intrinsic that it was not possible for people who used words in ordinary senses to deal safely with him, or to put any trust in him. The letters before us contain instances in point. In that of the 18th Jan. 1646 (p. 10), after admitting that, in a message on which he is commenting, he had given the parliament 'leave to hope for more than he intended,' he refers almost triumphantly to the words in which his message was couched, pointing out to the queen two minute distinctions which she had overlooked. He had not, he alleged, undertaken to give the parliament satisfaction, as she had understood, but merely to 'endeavour' to do so, and the end aimed at was to

be 'their security,' so that any thing which had in view 'his' security, and not 'theirs,' was not comprehended within his engagement.

"Another example occurs at p. 84. He is commenting upon a message relating to Ireland. The message ran that he would give the English parliament full satisfaction 'as to the managing of the war.' But he was really striving at that very time not to manage the war but to make a peace, so as to put the Irish in opposition to the parliament. What if the Irish took him at his word? What if the peace were concluded, how then could he satisfy the parliament in the way proposed? Charles bids his queen observe that he has 'so penned that article' that it may be interpreted to suit either case. If he 'finds reason to make peace,' he remarks, even at the very time when he had offered to the parliament to concur with them in prosecuting the war, 'there,' he asserts, his 'engagement ends.' This fatal trickery running through all his dealings, gradually alienated from him the heartiest and warmest of his defenders.

"A close examination of these letters will bring to light many other points, on which it will appear that Charles's character was thoroughly understood by those who opposed him. The more it becomes known amongst ourselves, the more will the calm endurance of these men, who submitted to his course of misgovernment for a period of fifteen years, excite our wonder and admiration."—Pp. xxvi—xxviii.

With the new proofs in our hands of the un-English and dishonourable character of Charles, we cannot but welcome the Act by which the Queen and Parliament have just abolished, together with other political services in the Prayer-book, the day for the observance of "the Martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles the First." To consecrate such a man as a martyr, and to go on, as the service for the thirtieth of January did, in drawing a parallel between the pseudo-martyr and the Saviour, is to offer violence to the genius of Christianity itself, and to bring discredit on the country in which such an observance is held. It was said many years ago, with equal truth and force, "The vital interests of the country demand that we should not canonize as a 'blessed martyr' a prince who fell in the attempt to establish arbitrary power, and to subdue men's consciences to a thralldom equal in its grievousness and ignominy to that of Rome in the proudest days of the Inquisition, or give up to revilings and maledictions the names of our forefathers who stood up, at the call of both patriotism and religion, 'in liberty's defence,'—who devoted to the well-being of their posterity their treasure and their blood,—and to whose wisdom, constancy and valour we owe the high reputation of England amongst the nations, and the unspeakable blessings which have been ever since growing up from their labours, blessings both civil and religious. . . . It is fighting against Time, and against the sense and feeling, the knowledge and spirit of the age, to keep up holy days and religious forms, fasts and festivals, which were meant in the first instance as a triumph over those that were thought to be for ever fallen, and which were further calculated and framed to consecrate tyranny and to bow down the understandings of the people, by means of the yoke put upon their consciences, to the unrighteous and degrading doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance—doctrines which the history of Europe shews to be not only destructive of the best interests of the people, but also fatal in the end even to the just power of their rulers."*

* Sermons by Rev. Robert Aspland, Vol. II. pp. 43—45.

Christian Days and Thoughts. By Rev. Ephraim Peabody, D.D. Pp. 304. London—Sampson Low. 1858.

As Dr. Peabody did not live to complete his purpose of preparing a kind of manual of devotional thoughts proper to the several periods and events of the Christian year, we may be thankful that the interesting volume now given us should have been prepared from his writings. We are presented with a series of devotional essays or discourses on Advent, Christmas, the New Year, Epiphany, Ash-Wednesday, First Sunday in Lent, Palm-Sunday, Thursday before Easter, Good-Friday, Easter Eve, Easter, Ascension-day, Whit-Sunday and All-Saints. There are also preparatory essays and others in conclusion.

Some friends of pure religion doubt the propriety of identifying the events of the Gospel history with particular seasons and days. They point to unmistakeable instances of superstition in the Churches of both Rome and England which have grown out of the observance of Saints' days, the season of Lent, and even some of the more special fasts and festivals expository of the life of Christ. They say, and not unwisely, that where superstitious observances, such as some churches countenance, prevail, the pure and spiritual and truly practical influences of the religion of the Saviour are apt to evaporate. Men content themselves with the form, and forget the spirit of the religion they profess. We are, however, disposed to think that the observance of times and seasons, kept within rational bounds, while it falls in with some natural aspirations and feelings of man, may also be made the effectual means of discrediting and putting aside mere idle and mischievous forms. Shew the man injured by a religion of forms and ceremonies what the moral and spiritual power of Christianity truly is, and you are more likely to win him than by a general censure of his religious usages. To an English Churchman whose mind is cramped by the pedantry of that ecclesiastical discipline which Puseyism has made *fashionable* (much of it is, we doubt not, a mere passing fashion), we would rather offer such a book as Dr. Peabody's than the most logical works demonstrating the idleness of his Church forms. How beautiful some of the thoughts of our author are, and how they are by the editor strung like pearls on the ecclesiastical frame-work he has slightly put together, we will indicate by one or two extracts taken, almost as the volume opens to us, here and there.

The Resurrection.

"I regard it as one of the internal evidences of the truth of Christianity, that while it passes by all secondary questions, it meets this greatest of questions, meets it fully, meets it in the only way in which it could be met—not with poetry; not by philosophical balancings of metaphysical proofs; not by sentimental phrases; not by vague conjectures; but by a visible fact. Up to that time, one appalling visible fact had dominated over the world—the fact of death. Death had reigned. All that had lived had died. The fathers were dead; sages were dead; oppressors and oppressed, the evil and the good were dead. The earth was one vast cemetery; and not one of its graves had been broken. Men might reason and hope and fear and half believe; but always these half beliefs were confronted by the visible fact from which there was no escape. The rising hope was chilled and frozen by a wind that blew across the place of graves. There was the inexorable fact of death and nothing to meet it. It tyrannized over the reason, more even than over the imagination of men. No voice had spoken from the closing tomb—no voice from the heavens. There was only silence above and death below.

"Christianity met that fact by the only evidence with which it could be met—it met the *skepticism* of the senses, by an *evidence addressed to the senses*,—by the resurrection from the dead. We talk of spirituality, as if it did not need this visible evidence. Let us thank God that he is more merciful than our folly asks. Somehow, here, our souls are connected with the body, and high as we may soar in faith, the highest flight must start from the earth. And God has given just the evidence we need for the immortal life, in the resurrection of Christ."—Pp. 219—221.

A Mother's Influence.

"The youth argues about the worth of religion. There is, he feigns, no reality in it. It is a delusion, a pretence, without life, without power either to support the trials or virtues of men. But he leaves his companions, he is alone, he reviews the past, and his heart reproaches him for the words he has uttered. Far away, on the bright horizon of his early years, stands one like an angel of light, belonging both to earth and to heaven, one long gone, but whom he will never forget,—the form of the mother of his childhood. He can remember, how with a strange, sweet awe, when he could hardly understand the words she uttered, though he knew the affection which prompted them, he was awakened from slumber by the tones of her voice in prayer as she knelt by his bedside before she slept. He remembers the still Sabbath hours when she repeated to him the words of Jesus—blessed words which he knew were in her heart. He remembers with what trusting resignation she bore affliction, and all her Christian gentleness and fidelity in trial, and her self-forgetting sacrifices for the good of others. He remembers how, struck by disease, she faded slowly away, cheerful when others were sad, how her soul dwelt upon the sweet words of Christian promise, how, when her child was alone with her, with fond tears that could not be repressed, she clasped him to her bosom, and raised his thoughts to heaven, and taught him to remember his Creator in the days of his youth. He remembers how her countenance was lit up with faith and trust, how in the hour of death, when all else wept, she alone was calm, and with her last whispered words committed his soul to God. He has seen a Christian mother live and die. He knows that hers was a soul that took hold on heaven. And, as he remembers these things, all the scoffs of the world could not make him doubt the worth of religion. A still small voice from that mother's deathbed and that mother's grave speaks to his soul, and he cannot doubt."—Pp. 289—291.

A Religion, not a Theology, the Want of the Times. A Plea for the Missionary Project of the Provincial Association of English Presbyterians in Lancashire and Cheshire. A Sermon, preached in Renshaw Street Chapel, Liverpool, Feb. 20, 1859. By John Hamilton Thom. Pp. 22. London—Whitfield.

THAT there may be, and sometimes actually is, pure religion in the soul, where there is little knowledge of theological systems in the head, we willingly admit. But that there generally prevails the divorce between Religion and Theology which Mr. Thom's title at least seems to indicate, we do not believe, nor do we wish such a state of things to be realized. Whenever the soul becomes sensible of religious influences, a craving for a theology will spring up. It must be so wherever the mind is in exercise. Does not Mr. Thom's own description of the religion he would have preached, shew that his "Religion, not a Theology," is a distinction without a difference?

"A living God—a divine Son, the Man that was in God's idea when He made our Human Nature, livingly manifested to His children in an earthly life—a Holy Spirit, tied to no conditions or notions of men, for ever stimu-

lating and for ever presenting the Goodness towards which it stimulates, and therefore for ever forgiving if for ever inciting—the infinite possibilities of glory and of peace to every one whose spirit has thus access to the living Sources of Perfection—and Christ himself as the greatest of the Results of that access,—this is our Religion, the Doctrine by which we must win the world.”—P. 18.

Here, surely, is theology, if it is anywhere. It is, we think, an abuse of terms to identify the word theology with the straitlaced dogmas of human creeds. There may be a narrow or a broad theology, a theology of common sense or one of mysticism, a theology of love or one of bitterness; but there is no reason, because we love freedom and common sense and charity, that therefore we are to discountenance and discard theology. Possibly we may have mistaken Mr. Thom's intended meaning. Lest we should have done so, we specially recommend our readers to peruse his sermon for themselves. They will find in it much with which they will agree, not a little of beauty and eloquence which they cannot but admire, and perchance some things which they do not clearly understand.

The question, which in part Mr. Thom discusses, of the best mode of reaching the intelligence and feelings of working men, is one of such great and practical importance, that we welcome any earnest and truthful inquirer into this field of investigation. We should be glad to think that the fact that “the administration of Religion having been hitherto too much shut up within congregational conditions,” of which Mr. Thom, following the suggestions of the *National Review*, speaks, sufficiently accounted for the indifference of the mass of mankind to our religion and worship. But other religious denominations are as much shut up in long-accustomed forms as ourselves. They make some way, though far less than they wish. There is, however, this consolation for the Unitarian church, that if its failure to evangelize any considerable portion of society have resulted from defective religious administration in past times, the modes now in use are so marked with individual independence and divergence, that in the various modes of thought, speech and action adopted by our friends, some one amongst them will find the road that may lead the Unitarian church to that degree of influence and usefulness which in our view rightfully belongs to it.

Mr. Thom is opening out one path, and with singular ability and zeal. We shall watch with interest his operations, and if he is enabled by the preaching of what he evidently regards as the most *spiritual* form of Christianity, to attract and sustain the attention and convictions of the masses, hitherto indifferent to religion, or at least to such religion as we teach, we shall not be indisposed to admit his claim to increased confidence as a religious guide, a spiritual pioneer. But the object of religious reformation is so vast, that there is room and need for all to do what they can, and in the mode for which they feel themselves best qualified. Few are capable of climbing to the spiritual heights in which men like Mr. Thom and Mr. Martineau habitually soar, but every man may, if he will, do something to promote religious knowledge and Christian practice.

The Divinity of Christ, being a Reply to a Pamphlet bearing that Title recently circulated in Adelaide. A Lecture, delivered on Sunday Evening, January 3, 1858, in the Unitarian Christian Church, Adelaide, South Australia. By John Crawford Woods, B.A. 12mo. Pp. 35.

THE Unitarian cause goes on well, as it deserves to do, under the able ministry of Mr. Woods at Adelaide. The pamphlet now before us is on many accounts a notable document. It shews that the Unitarian controversy is exciting interest wherever the English tongue and English civilization prevail. The style in which the Lecture is got up, speaks well for a colonial press. The subject matter is skilfully handled, and the result of the Lecture was an immediate accession of members to the Adelaide Unitarian church. The interest which Mr. Woods succeeds in creating is the more satisfactory, as the efforts at counteraction taken in the colony by the Dean and other clergymen in preaching anti-Unitarian discourses have failed to sustain public attention. The vigour of the Unitarian advocate at Adelaide does not appear to have been relaxed by the intense heat which has, according to recent accounts from our antipodes, prevailed. With the thermometer standing in the shade at noon at 120 deg., and 154 deg. in the sun, it argues no common zeal in the soldier of Christ to buckle on his armour and turn out in defence of gospel truth. We must also receive printed books and pamphlets from our Australian colonies with the recollection that their production there involves five or even six times the cost of similar works in our press-groaning country.

Tunes for the Christian Church and Home. Warrington.

THIS neat and inexpensive volume, just issued from Mr. Philip Carpenter's press at Warrington, and edited by him, supplies a want long felt in our schools and churches, of a cheap and popular selection of good Psalm Tunes. It is adapted to Mr. Martineau's Hymns for the Christian Church and Home. We fear we shall scarcely live to see such an advance in the musical education of our countrymen, that the Editor's wish may be gratified of seeing his Tunes used as "a handbook which may be distributed through the congregation and held with the hymn-book, enabling all to take their appropriate part in the psalmody." Forty Chants are prefixed to the Psalm Tunes. We are glad to observe the wider adoption in our services of this class of music. It serves to give not only variety, but a cheerful vivacity or the deepest solemnity, as may be required, to our worship. The Editor expresses his "deep veneration for the memory of the late Rev. S. C. Fripp, under the guidance of whose exquisite taste the organ at Lewin's Mead chapel, Bristol, was wont not so much to play the tunes, as to utter forth the very hymns which the congregation were singing."

The Library of Biblical Literature. London—Freeman. 1857.

FIVE volumes of this carefully compiled work have now appeared, containing forty essays illustrative of the geography, history, biography, archæology and general literature of the Bible. The Library supplies a useful series of handbooks for vestry classes and the upper rooms of the Sunday-school.

INTELLIGENCE.

DR. ROBERT LEE AND THE PRESBYTERY OF EDINBURGH.

DR. LEE, Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities in the University of Edinburgh and Minister of the Old Greyfriars', is generally understood to entertain somewhat more liberal sentiments than those usually held by the clergy of the Church of Scotland. Indeed it is whispered that his views in regard to some points of Calvinistic divinity are not strictly orthodox; though, as far as we are aware, this has never been made the subject of any charge against him. His congregation, as might be expected, consists chiefly of those who have little sympathy with the stricter theology usually taught in Presbyterian places of worship; and it is certainly remarkable that not a few of them formerly attended the Unitarian chapel, and, while still retaining their old belief, find nothing to offend them in Dr. Lee's mode of conducting divine service. Dr. Lee is a popular minister amongst his own congregation, but his brethren of the Presbytery look askance at him; and he, on his part, entertains no very friendly feelings towards his brethren.

Since Dr. Lee became minister of the Old Greyfriars' church, several innovations have been introduced by him in the manner of conducting divine worship, which have been recently made the subject of an inquiry on the part of his Presbytery. In order that our readers may understand the nature of the charge, it is necessary to remind them that, in the Church of Scotland, service is generally commenced by singing a psalm; the prayers are extempore, or recited from memory—indeed, in the country parishes, if a minister were to read his prayer, the people would think it was the Pope himself, if not somebody worse, and would probably walk out of the church—and, lastly, it is customary to stand during the prayers, and to sit while singing. Now, in all these points Dr. Lee has transgressed. He begins with a verse of scripture and a prayer; he not only reads his prayers, but reads them from a printed form which he has lately published; and his people stand to sing, while they kneel, or more truly sit, to pray. The meeting of the Presbytery of Edinburgh at which this question was discussed took place on Wednesday, Feb. 23 of the present year. The following extract from the *Scotsman*

will indicate more precisely the nature of the charge against Dr. Lee:

"Dr. BALFOUR, who had put the question in regard to the alleged innovations to Dr. Lee at last meeting, laid on the table a copy of Dr. Lee's book, entitled 'Prayers for Public Worship.'

"Dr. LEE then said—The Rev. Dr. Balfour, at the last meeting of Presbytery, put to me the following question—'Have you not introduced into public worship, as conducted by you in Old Greyfriars' church, an order of divine service, together with the use of a liturgy or formula of public devotion, and certain forms or postures in devotional exercises unknown to this Church, and inconsistent with the rules and practice thereof?' Now, in order that I may answer this question—in order that I may be able to say whether an order of divine service unknown to the Church, and inconsistent with its rules and practice, has been introduced, I must solicit the Rev. Doctor to inform me in the first place what is that order of divine service which is known to the Church and is consistent with its rules and practice. Until I know that, of course I can say nothing. In the second place, I have to ask the Rev. Doctor what he understands by a liturgy?—because I may understand by a liturgy something very different from what the Rev. Doctor understands by it, and it may happen that I shall answer that question by saying that I have not introduced a liturgy. The Court will therefore see that it is absolutely necessary that the Rev. father of the Presbytery should give me information on these two points.

"Dr. BALFOUR—I take the order of worship which is known to the Church and consistent with the rules and practice thereof to be that which is generally—I believe always, practised by the ministers of the Church—what we are accustomed to every day, and what Dr. Lee has done for more than ten years himself. As to the liturgy, it is a word I would rather never have used, but I mean by it just a printed form of prayers.

"Dr. LEE suggested that this answer should be taken down.

"Dr. MACFARLANE—It must not be forgotten that the question put to Dr. Lee is the question of the Presbytery, that the Presbytery allowed the question to be put, and that Dr. Balfour was not called on to give the answer which he has just done. I don't object to that answer, but he was no

more called upon to answer it than any of the other members who acceded to the question being put; and I am not prepared to admit that Dr. Lee at this stage has any right to ask that the answer shall be taken down.

“Dr. LEE—From which I understand that Dr. Macfarlane identifies himself with Dr. Balfour in this matter, and therefore I shall discuss it under that supposition.

“Dr. MACFARLANE said he was neither more nor less identified with it than other parties who acceded to the question being put.

“Dr. LEE—Very well. I will accept Dr. Balfour's answer as the answer of the Court. (No, no.) I have got, at all events, the sense which the Rev. father of the Presbytery attaches to the two propositions, and that will serve my purpose.

“Dr. NISBET rose to order. It seemed to him very extraordinary that a member of this Court, who had on more than one occasion solemnly declared that he adhered to and would maintain the worship, order and discipline of the Church, should ask the Court of which he was a member to give a definition at this time of day of what that order, practice and discipline were. He conceived that a person accused or suspected of a violation of the statute law of the land had just as good a right to ask the Court which tried him to tell him what the statute law of the land was. Dr. Robt. Lee should have known very well what the practice and what the laws of the Church were, and this Court was not bound to answer any such question.

“In reference to an observation by Dr. BRYCE, who opposed the putting of the question to Dr. Lee at last meeting,

“Dr. SIMPSON read the Act of last General Assembly on this subject:—‘That the General Assembly earnestly and solemnly warn all members of the Church against the rash adoption of changes in the order and form of public worship as established in the Directory of Public Worship, confirmed by Acts of Assembly, and presently practised in this Church.’

“Dr. BRYCE—Then we are proceeding under the deliverance of the General Assembly.

“Dr. MACFARLANE—The deliverance of the General Assembly may be quoted as expository of the meaning of the Assembly in this question, but it does not follow from that, that we are proceeding on that Act.”

Dr. Lee then entered upon his defence. To the first question regarding the order of divine service, he gave a direct negative, maintaining that the order now practised in his church was minutely the order

of the Directory for the Public Worship of God. The Directory, he said, had never been abrogated. On the contrary, it had been repeatedly confirmed. It had been approved by the General Assembly in 1645. It had been ratified and approved by the Estates immediately afterwards. It is treated as an authoritative document by Walter Steuart, of Pardovan, in his “Collections and Observations of Church Government and Discipline”—and this work of Pardovan's was spoken of so lately as 1830 as having as much authority in regard to the laws of the Scottish Church as any institutional work could have in respect to the civil law. Dr. Lee was bound, indeed, by his ordination vow to adhere to the order of worship *presently in use*. But the Act which required this vow from ministers at their ordination was passed in 1711. At this time the Directory was the authority, and it was therefore to the Directory alone that he or any of his brethren had committed themselves. It was said, however, that custom was the law; but in the civil law, before custom can obtain legal validity, three conditions must meet. There must be no statute law provided for the case; it must be a custom time out of mind; and, thirdly, before any custom can be admitted as a part of the common law, the evidence of its being a custom must be found in the decisions of the Courts. Now there are no decisions of the General Assembly giving to custom an authority superior to that of the Directory. If it had become the custom to preach heretical doctrines, would any minister who returned to the orthodox standard be charged with a breach of law? During the last century, it was an almost universal custom to omit the reading of the Sacred Scriptures in church; but would any one bring an accusation against a minister who, under such circumstances, broke through the custom and returned to the rule prescribed by the Directory?

The next question related to a liturgy. A liturgy is a service ordained by public authority in the Church, and binding on those who minister in the Church. The Directory itself is, in its essential character, a liturgy. It contains a great deal against the Book of Common Prayer, but not a syllable against liturgies in general. Dr. Lee's book was not a liturgy. He had chosen to compose and print and publish certain prayers. They were his own composition. He had not stolen them from anybody, except a few of them from those ancient Fathers with whom the brethren around him were so well acquainted. He

had in his possession half-a-dozen volumes of Prayers for public worship printed and published in like manner by ministers of the Church of Scotland.

The following little bit is so spicy, it must be given verbatim:

“Dr. LEE—Well, why am I to be a criminal for doing what so many other people have done? I should like to know what speciality there is in my case, that that which is innocent and commendable in everybody else, must, forsooth, be blameworthy or criminal in me. A printed form of prayer is a liturgy. If it be so, there is a considerable number of ministers in the Church chargeable with the offence, and I do wish there were a great many more. (Cheers.)

“Dr. BALFOUR—There is a printed form of prayer; but the prayer is read by the minister instead of in the usual way in Scotland.

“Dr. LEE—That is the liturgy, is it?

“Dr. BALFOUR—Yes.

“Dr. LEE—Well, that is another most original idea. How does the Rev. Doctor ascertain that I read these prayers?

“Dr. MACFARLANE—Dr. Balfour only asked the question.

“Dr. LEE—Then I intend to answer the question in this way: As there is no law of the Church respecting the reading of prayers any more than the reading of sermons, I take the same liberty in respect to the reading of prayers which everybody else does in respect to the reading of sermons. (Applause.) If the one be right, both are right; if one be wrong, both are wrong; if the one be allowable, both are allowable. I don't say that I read prayers, or to what extent I read prayers. But I say I have as much right to read my prayers as you have to read your sermons, and that that is a question you have no more right to ask me than you have to ask whether in the pulpit I read without spectacles or with them. (Laughter.)”

The third question regarded certain forms or postures introduced into public worship in the Greyfriars' church. Dr. Lee proceeded to shew that standing to sing was not wholly unknown to the Church of Scotland. It is customary still in the Orkney Islands. The members of the General Assembly are in the habit of singing a psalm at the conclusion of their meetings, and for this they always stand. Why, then, should not the congregation of the Greyfriars stand to sing if they choose it? As to the kneeling to pray, if it was unknown, it was a great pity, and it was time that it was known. Dr. Lee hoped that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were not un-

known to the Church of Scotland. We find that Daniel knelt—that Peter knelt—that Paul knelt. It would be somewhat presumptuous, then, for the General Assembly or the Presbytery of Edinburgh to censure Dr. Lee and his congregation for doing what Daniel, Peter and Paul had done. Nor is there any law in the Directory to forbid kneeling to pray; and what is not forbidden is permitted. Where there is no law, there is no transgression. In conclusion, Dr. Lee complained, very reasonably we think, that no private hint had ever been given to him by any of his brethren that he was supposed to be breaking the law of the Church. Nor had he received any intimation of the charge to be brought against him, until the question to which he had just replied was laid upon the table.

On Dr. Lee's resuming his seat, Mr. Alexander Ramsay said, that he entirely concurred in every word that had fallen from Dr. Lee, and that in the kirk-session of Old Greyfriars' church there was nothing but entire cordiality and unanimity regarding the changes introduced.—Dr. Bryce then moved, That having heard Dr. Lee in reply to the question of Dr. Balfour, the Presbytery find it unnecessary to proceed further in this case. After some further discussion, however, the following resolution was carried by a majority of twenty-one to fourteen:—“That having heard Dr. Lee in answer to the question put to him, and not being satisfied with the explanation which accompanied his answer, the Presbytery appoint a committee of their number to inquire more fully into the facts of the case in connection with the question put to Dr. Lee, instructing them to confer with Dr. Lee and his kirk-session, and to report on the book laid on their table, in so far as Dr. Lee admits it to be an exponent of the mode in which public worship is conducted in his church.”

How this curious affair will terminate cannot be predicted with certainty. It is probable, however, that the matter will eventually be brought before the General Assembly, and should Dr. Lee then be found to have transgressed the law of the Church, it will be necessary for him to return to the old system. It is a remarkable case, as shewing that in priest-ridden Scotland there exists a tendency even amongst the clergy to break loose from the bonds of the old stiff-necked Presbyterianism; and the sympathy manifested by the laity for the innovations in the Old Greyfriars' proves how widely this feeling prevails. Doubtless the real ground of the attack upon Dr. Lee is the desire

to check any tendency towards Independence either in discipline or doctrine. But it would certainly have been more politic, at least, to have passed the alleged innovations without notice, as the Doctor seems quite a match for his opponents, and, whether he gains the victory or not, his example is likely to spread. Indeed, we do not see how he can fail to be triumphant in one way or another; for it is highly improbable that his congregation will submit to be dictated to, even if the General Assembly should decide against the innovations. On the other hand, Dr. Lee is far too wise to carry his opposition to his Presbytery too far. He knows precisely how far he may go, and when he must stop. He understands perfectly what he is about, and has not the slightest idea of being made a martyr to the cause of Church Reform. He despises his brethren, and openly sneers at their ignorance; while he prides himself on his own erudition—which, however, is nothing at all wonderful—but he knows exactly when to yield, and he will yield anything that can be demanded from him rather than run the risk of losing his position. It is well, perhaps, that there should be a few Dr. Lees in the Church of Scotland, to advocate the principles of Christianity apart from the theological garniture with which, in Scotland particularly, they are almost always invested. Such men doubtless do good in drawing into some connection with Christianity those who would otherwise be content to live wholly without God in the world; yet such good cannot be unmixed with evil, as we must admit when we remember that every minister attached to a church whose doctrines he does not believe and does not preach, sets an example of unconscientious conformity as often as he enters the pulpit. The Scotch, however, either love or fear their own Church too much, or, what we believe would be in a great number of cases equally true, they are too indifferent to all churches, to care to encounter the odium of dissent. We have little expectation of seeing Unitarianism as such make much visible progress in Scotland. There, as elsewhere, the Unitarians must be content to be the pioneers of reform—an honourable post, no doubt, but one of some difficulty, and demanding some patience and resolution. But reform must eventually come from within; and we look with interest at this case of Dr. Lee, as possibly indicating the first movement in that direction. Meantime, we cannot but fear that while the Westminster Confession holds its place as the standard of

orthodoxy, it will always have sufficient influence effectually to check all real freedom of thought; and until that terrible incubus be removed, we have no hope of seeing the theological learning on which Dr. Lee prides himself, and which, no doubt, he instils into the minds of his students, conferring any distinction upon Scotland.

MOSSLEY, LANCASHIRE—ORDINATION SERVICES.

On Sunday, March 6th, the Rev. George Fox was ordained pastor of the Christian church in the above place. The election of a stated minister for the church excited a considerable degree of interest in the neighbourhood, and about 700 or 800 persons attended both of the services, the charge to the minister having been delivered in the afternoon, and the charge to the congregation having been given in the evening. A number of persons also attended from the surrounding districts, who, in accordance with a good old rule of Mossley hospitality, were entertained by members of the congregation.

The introductory service in the afternoon was performed by the Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A.; and, after a hymn,

Mr. JAMES ROBINSON rose to present the invitation to the minister. After reading the resolution inviting Mr. George Fox, student of the Home Missionary Board, to become the minister of the church, Mr. Robinson said—In presenting you this formal invitation, the congregation are aware that, however well and efficiently you may supply this pulpit, to carry out the objects which you and the congregation have in view, you must and ought to have their kindly sympathies, their active co-operation, and their sincere prayers. I hope this will be the case,—that both minister and people will labour heart and soul together to sow the seeds of truth, and to build up a church of which Jesus Christ himself shall be the chief corner-stone,—and that very many will bless the day you came among them as a minister of Jesus Christ.

Rev. GEORGE FOX replied. He felt deeply that he had undertaken a great and important work, particularly in the vast field connected with that church. The task of spreading abroad the truths of the gospel would, however, be an impossible one, did there not lie deep in the soul of man, placed there by God, the love of religion and the strong yearning for spiritual good. With the thought that he was appealing to the highest wants and aspirations, he should be strengthened in the per-

formance of his arduous duties. His task, too, was the more pleasant because he had to proclaim a religion of love. He was glad that he had a religion which was stripped of those dark and terrible dogmas which had been engrafted on pure Christianity. He felt that the work before him was an arduous one; yet, with the blessing of God and the kind wishes of the congregation, he hoped much good might be done.

The charge to the minister was given by the Rev. Dr. Beard, who took for his text Acts xx. 28. The Rev. Dr. preached an animated and eloquent discourse, in which he earnestly warned the young pastor to be faithful to his holy calling; and exhorted him, as his course of duty, to build up a church, to preach a doctrine, and to live the Christian life.

In the evening, the service was introduced by the Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A.; after which the Rev. J. Gordon gave the right hand of fellowship to the young minister, assuring him of his hearty sympathy with him in his new sphere of labour.

Rev. G. Fox briefly responded. In returning his sincere thanks, he said he was cheered by the thought that he was not alone in the ministry, but that there were others labouring in the same field. He hoped he should not be an unworthy member of the bond of Christian ministers.

Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A., then delivered the charge to the congregation. The text was from Philippians i. 28, and a truly admirable discourse was preached. He entreated the congregation to remember the trials and difficulties of a young minister, and the necessity there was of kindly and affectionate sympathy on their part. He exhorted them to be punctual in their attendance on public worship, and ever to stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel.

A hymn and benediction concluded the services of this interesting day.

BIRMINGHAM UNITARIAN BROTHERLY SOCIETY.

At the annual meeting of the above Society, held in the room at the back of the Old Meeting-house, Old Meeting Street, on Tuesday evening, February 8th, 1859, the following report was read by Mr. Geo. Simmons:

The number of pupils in the Unitarian Sunday-schools in Birmingham at the present time, 1616; increase during the past year, 44. Course of instruction—reading, writing, arithmetic, religious culture, his-

tory, grammar, geography, dictation and composition, imparted by 300 teachers; increase, 8. Volumes in Libraries, 10,157; increase, 231. Amount paid to Libraries for use of books, £64. 15s. 4½d.; increase, £4. 10s. 8½d. Number of pupils depositing their savings with the schools, 587; increase, 53. Amount deposited, £361. 15s. 1d.; increase, £23. 5s. 11½d. during the past year. In connection with the Brotherly Society and Sunday-schools is the old-established Benefit Society, now in its sixty-first year, which, besides providing gratuitous surgical attendance, allows to those members who have been subscribers five years at 4d. per week the unprecedented sum of 18s. per week in case of illness. Number of subscribers to the Benefit Society, 493; increase, 35. Amount received by subscriptions to Benefit Society, £231. 2s. 3d. Amount received by interest on capital, £263. 6s. 10d. Amount paid for illness, deaths and surgical attendance, £247. 12s. 10d., being a decrease of expenditure compared with 1857 by £21. 2s. 5d. Total capital of the Birmingham Unitarian Brotherly Benefit Society, £5827. 6s. 11d.; increase during the year 1858, £241. 4s. 10½d.

BRIDGE STREET, MANCHESTER.

The annual soirée of the teachers and friends of Strangeways Sunday-school (Dr. Beard's) was held in the school-room on Friday evening last, the 18th inst. About 150 persons assembled for tea at half-past six o'clock. At half-past seven o'clock the Rev. Dr. Beard took the chair. A programme of the evening's proceedings prepared by the teachers was put into his hands, and he proceeded at once to call upon the choir for a glee. After the glee, several of the teachers gave readings and recitations from various authors. Mr. P. Woolley, the Secretary of the school, then performed a solo from Verdi upon the piano with considerable ability and spirit.

Mr. Jas. C. Street, of the Home Missionary Board, was then called upon to address the meeting. He expressed his gratification at being present at so interesting a meeting; and, after some further remarks, spoke of the different characteristics of Calvinism and Unitarianism as they grew up side by side. He said that while the one threw a deep gloom over everything connected with religion, the other developed a healthy and happy life, and made religion a continual joy. The one was dark and cloudy and belonged to the night, the other was light and transparent and belonged to the day. He congratulated the teachers and congregation upon the fact

that they could assemble together for such real intellectual enjoyment, without feeling that they were doing anything opposed to the spirit of true religion, and he expressed the hope that the good and genial spirit existing among themselves would be infused among their pupils in the Sunday-school.

A scene from Shakespeare's "Much Ado about Nothing" was then performed by a company of the teachers.

After an interval of half an hour, Dr. Beard resumed the chair. Songs and glees were then sung, various readings and recitations were also given by the teachers, and Mr. Woolley again performed a solo upon the pianoforte—"La ci darem" by Mozart.

Mr. Harry Rawson then addressed the meeting. After some introductory remarks, he advised the teachers to be especially careful to attend to the cultivation of their own minds as a most important duty. He suggested that they should read only the best books which were accessible to them. There was a great danger of falling into the habit of reading light and useless literature. Books that could be read and grasped without much effort were of very little value as a general rule. He also said that teachers receive great personal benefits from teaching. They learned most thus. Nearly all great men had been teachers. After some further observations, he concluded by reciting an old ballad, which was exceedingly interesting.

Two scenes from "The Rivals" of R. B. Sheridan were then performed with considerable efficiency. The choir then gave another glee; and the meeting, which had been throughout of a highly interesting character, terminated at about half-past ten o'clock.

MR. MADGE'S FAREWELL SERMON.

On Sunday morning, March 27, Rev. Thos. Madge, in the presence of a large, attentive and much-interested congregation, delivered his last sermon at Essex-Street chapel as the sole pastor of the society. Taking for his subject the characteristics of pure Christianity, he expatiated on it with an energy of manner, breadth of view, and in a felicitous style not often surpassed by himself in the maturity of his strength. Towards the close of his sermon, he reminded the congregation that for thirty years it had been his aim to diffuse amongst them the

influences of the religion of which they had just heard the description. The personal references with which the preacher closed a truly admirable sermon, touched both himself and his warmly-attached and grateful flock. Before they separated, they took means to provide an organ to increase the attractiveness of the future services of the chapel. The zeal and liberality evinced on the occasion are a pleasing augury of the continued prosperity of the congregation.

FRENCH PROTESTANTISM.

A legal decision of extreme importance was given on the 20th Jan. at Colmar. A Protestant having lent to one of his Catholic friends a controversial book from his own library, was prosecuted by the public authorities for having violated the laws regulating *colportage*, or book-hawking for sale. Bessner, the accused, was condemned to a fine of fifty francs and costs. He has entered an appeal. (From *Le Lien*, Jan. 29 and Feb. 5.)

THE KING OF PRUSSIA.

Certain *Ultramontane* journals have lately entertained their readers with a story of the poor demented King of Prussia's conversion to Romanism! Some time ago a similar report was spread of the King of Wurtemberg, who caused it to be officially contradicted. If the present rumour is not worth contradicting, neither ought it to be considered worth spreading.

TERCENTENARY OF FRENCH PROTESTANTISM.

It will be 300 years next May since the assembling of the first Constituent Synod, from which the common existence of the Reformed Churches in France dates. The Conference of Paris, with this interesting reminiscence at hand, lately appointed a "Jubilee Commission" to consider the proper mode of celebrating this great festival. Some dissension seems to have occurred through the fear that it was intended to re-establish Synods and a Confession of Faith. There seems, indeed, to be no occasion for any such alarm; but it is well to know that our Protestant friends in France feel as much jealousy of spiritual authority as ourselves; and we doubt not their grand Tercentenary meeting will give emphasis to the principles of spiritual freedom and theological progress.

OBITUARY.

Jan. 15, at Northiam, the Rev. JOHN EDWARDS, aged 78 years, for many years minister of the Unitarian General Baptist church in that place. His loss, it is greatly to be feared, is irreparable. Since his death the chapel has been closed. In the Weald of Kent and Sussex there were formerly several flourishing General Baptist congregations, whose principles of free inquiry led them to embrace the simple and scriptural faith of Unitarian Christianity. These societies were for many years ministered to by earnest and zealous men, who were to a great degree self-educated, but yet mighty in the Scriptures through diligent and unfettered study. This race of men has been rapidly dying out. Before long, the visible traces of their labours will pass away from this district, unless the Unitarians who live in large towns shall feel it their duty to fan the smoking flax into a flame. But this is a subject too important and too extensive to be entered upon in a short obituary. At Northiam and Rolvenden, within five miles of each other, are two chapels in excellent repair. With hardly an exception, the attendants are poor. Unless a helping hand be soon stretched forth, the flocks will be dispersed and the chapels fall to decay. The state of affairs, particularly with regard to the congregation for which he had so long laboured, was the only subject of anxious thought to Mr. Edwards during his last illness. He died of an attack of asthma, with which he had been long afflicted. He was interred on the 19th of January, at Northiam, in the burial-ground connected with the chapel, by his old friend and neighbour, the Rev. Edward Talbot, of Tenterden, and who on the following Sunday, at Tenterden, preached his funeral sermon, from the words, John xi. 25.

The following is an extract from the discourse delivered on that occasion :

“I have thus endeavoured, in compliance with the wish of our dear departed friend, to say a few words with the view of causing us to strive for a happy end. For him death had no terrors. So strongly was he impressed with the conviction that the great change is but a sleep, from which we shall awake to find ourselves still in the care of God, that when it drew near, the same happy, cheerful peacefulness which characterized him in life accompanied him to the period of his latest consciousness: even in the delirium of illness he fancied he was addressing the word of exhortation to those for whom he had long laboured in the Lord.

“Peaceful, humble trust in the goodness and mercy of God as made known by our Lord Jesus Christ, was the sustainer of our friend's happiness, living and dying. The religion which he had preached, and the power of which to be a guide through the whole of our earthly pilgrimage he illustrated by a holy, useful and benevolent life, supported him in the hour of weakness, and cast the brightness of immortal hope over his closing days. He loved much the Heavenly Father and Jesus the Saviour. Hence his was a labour of love, and all he did he thought but too little as an expression of what was due to the Source of all temporal and eternal good.

“May his humility be a lesson to us ! Though with regard to God we are all unprofitable servants, and shall do well to cultivate the conviction in our hearts, yet we may learn by the active usefulness of him whom we mourn, that we may be profitable and a source of blessing one to another; that we may so fulfil our social relationships and our Christian responsibilities, as that those who come after us shall be wiser, holier, happier, through our teaching and example. For several years Mr. Edwards laboured as the unremunerated minister of the Unitarian General Baptist church at Northiam, striving to build up those who thought with him in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. There he held the office of standard-bearer to a small band of Christians who deemed it their duty to bear testimony to the great scriptural truth that there is but one God, the Father, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

“But the maintenance of his views, both as a Unitarian and a General Baptist, never interfered with the respect and friendship and love which he felt for those who differed from him on doctrinal views. He knew that to his own Master every man must stand or fall, and believed that all who seek for the truth and walk according to their light God will receive and bless.

“Our beloved friend was naturally of a happy and cheerful disposition. This natural gift, under the blessed influences of Christian hope and charity, became converted into a heavenly grace and abiding principle. Hence trials (of which he had his share, for he lived to lose in one pursuit the competence that he had gained in another) which bow down and affect the mental elasticity of many, seemed almost to leave him untouched, so that even in advanced life he possessed much of the

sanguine temperament and happy cheerfulness of youth.

"Mr. Edwards was a remarkable instance of the truth of the words,

'Religion never was design'd
To make our pleasures less.'

But there was no thoughtless levity in his joyousness. His was the sunshine of a heart trustful in God, who, he felt, regarded as an acceptable sacrifice the grateful and virtuous enjoyment of divine mercies. With these dispositions, it is not surprising that he was a general favourite with the young, and that he was thus often enabled to give that word in season which became lastingly blessed, because it was sown in hearts softened through affection to the adviser, and having faith in the sincerity and holy life of him that spake them.

"No more shall we look on the countenance of our dear friend, radiant with sympathetic kindness, nor listen to his earnest admonitions in the sanctuary; no more shall we behold him in our homes, nor welcome him to our social gatherings. The place that once knew him shall know him no more. He cannot come to us. May the God and Father of our risen Saviour prepare us to join him by a life of pious devotion to God, of self-denying benevolence and inward holiness! Thus may we prove the sincerity of our love and trust in God, and through the grace of our Heavenly Father be permitted to participate in the joys of the spirits of the just made perfect! Amen."

MR. CHARLES BARNES, who died at the protracted age of 81, at the house of his son-in-law, Dr. Beard, of Manchester,* was brought up among the Independents or Congregationalists, and for many years attended the services of the Rev. John Griffin, an acceptable minister of that denomination in Portsea, Hants. Mr. Barnes being a thoughtful and earnest man, as well as deeply and practically religious, grew dissatisfied with the teachings of orthodoxy, as contradicted at once by Scripture and by his own intelligence. For some time he struggled in great distress of mind to put down or put away the light from heaven which his Heavenly Father had sent to lead him out of darkness. The aid of his acknowledged spiritual guide was kindly offered and thankfully accepted. In vain, however, did Mr. Barnes struggle against God. "The truth as it is in Jesus" took entire possession of his mind, and conscience compelled him to quit the

communion which had ceased to satisfy his religious wants. About the same time other persons living in or near the same town seceded from popular churches. With them Mr. Barnes entered into Christian fellowship. Among their preachers was the revered father of Dr. Beard. A church was formed and a place of worship was erected. The members were in reality Unitarians, though they made the doctrine of Universal Salvation their rallying-point. For years much good was done. Circumstances, however, arose which broke up the Universalist church. Then Mr. Barnes, Mr. Beard and other of the members, connected themselves either with the General Baptist church, of which Mr. Foster is now the minister, or the Presbyterian (Unitarian) chapel in High Street, Portsmouth, then presided over by that "man of God," the late Rev. Russell Scott. With his new pastor Mr. Barnes soon became intimate. He made himself useful in the congregation in various ways, and at last served as Treasurer until he left Portsea for Manchester. There he resided many years in the enjoyment of solid, unbroken and unwavering religious peace, and gradually preparing for an entrance into the inner apartments of his Heavenly Father's house, by a conversation at once useful, honourable and benignant. Scarcely ever was there a brighter old age, a more serene decline, a less to be regretted sunset. His bereaved relatives regarded it as a great solace that their dear friend, the Rev. Edmund Kell, who had for so many years known and valued Mr. Barnes, was in their neighbourhood. With his well-known kindness, Mr. Kell put aside for a moment the important object he has so praiseworthily taken in hand, in order to conduct the religious services for which the occasion called. Those services, acceptable to all, were specially soothing to one who had long watched over her father with thoughtful and tender care, and who finds in his departure an additional and prevailing reason for setting her affection on things above, amid which she has more than one precious treasure.

"He who goeth forth weeping with his seed,
Shall return rejoicing with his sheaves."
(Ps. cxxvi. 6.)

Subjoined is an extract from the sermon preached (Feb. 27th) by Mr. Kell:

"My brethren, you have lost from your midst within the past week one who we have reason to know lived in some humble measure prepared, according to the gospel measure of preparation, to meet his God—one whose character remains as an example and encouragement to his fellow-

* See Christian Reformer, p. 192.

worshippers. You remember with what alacrity and constancy he attended the services of the sanctuary while health and strength permitted, and the pleasure with which he joined in your occasional social gatherings—at one of which, only a few weeks since, the bright sunshine of his countenance will not easily be forgotten. It has been my privilege very recently to have been under the same roof with him for some weeks, and to have had several conversations with him on the subject of death. He always expressed himself perfectly willing to leave this world whenever it should please his Heavenly Father to take him. He had no fear of death, but trusted for acceptance from the free mercy of his God, as declared by Jesus Christ. He rejoiced to have escaped those dark views of the attributes of the Omniscent One which in early life had prevented him from tasting the full, deep joys of the gospel. He delighted to dwell on the promises of the Saviour—‘that in his Father’s house are many mansions;’ ‘that he is gone before to prepare places for his faithful followers;’ and ‘that where he is, there shall his true disciples be.’ His last act, before he was seized with paralysis, from which he never even partially recovered, was one his mourning relatives will ever remember with comfort and joy. It was night. He had just risen from his knees, having commended his spirit to the God who gave it, when the summons came. How many of us, my friends, may covet to be found, when the hour of our death arrives, in the same hallowed act—communing with God on earth, ere we are called to His nearer, His heavenly presence! He could truly say, ‘I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day.’

“In our departed friend was well exemplified the power which Unitarian Christianity has to support the soul in the last hour, and to sway the heart through life. In parting with him, we cannot but feel that in him the words of Scripture were verified: ‘Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace.’ Oh, may every one of us, my brethren, depart hence with renewed resolution that, like the Christian brother who has gone before us, we will endeavour to ‘walk in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless.’”

Feb. 17, of bronchitis, after a short illness, T. K. HERVEY, Esq., aged 60, for many years Editor of the *Athenæum*.

Feb. 19, in the 71st year of his age, Mr. EDWARD BRAHAM, of Grundesburgh, near Ipswich. The deceased had been a regular attendant at the Unitarian chapel, Ipswich, for nearly fifty years, though residing at a distance of seven miles. He was much respected by all who knew him, as a thoroughly upright man and a consistent Unitarian.

Feb. 20, at Somersham, Hants, JAMES, eldest son of Mr. J. WILES, in his 18th year.

Feb. 27, after a long illness, and much regretted by numerous friends, MARTHA ANN, the beloved wife of the Rev. M. A. MOON, of Stannington, near Sheffield, in her 30th year.

March 8, at York, Rev. WILLIAM DUFFIELD, formerly minister of the Unitarian congregation at Doncaster.

March 19, at Upper Clapton, aged 45, HELENA, daughter of the late David GIBBS, Esq. For thirty years she was a sufferer from illness, which baffled all available medical skill; for the last twenty years she was confined to her couch. The gentle patience with which she bore her sufferings, and her habitual cheerfulness, awoke the admiration of all who were admitted to her sick chamber. The simple truths and bright hopes of Unitarian Christianity gave her strength in weakness.

March 21, at his residence, Clapton Square, Hackney, in his 79th year, JOHN EDWIN NETTERVILLE, Esq., for 54 years a member of the Stock Exchange.

Mr. Netterville was through life distinguished by a high sense of honour, by bright and cheerful spirits, which sickness and adversity could scarcely subdue, but above all by the goodness of his heart. By personal conviction he became a Unitarian, and was not only a regular attendant on the services at the Gravel-Pit chapel, but the close personal friend of the minister, the late Rev. Robert Aspland. He fulfilled the duties of Treasurer during a period of some importance to the congregation, and with singular success. His remains were interred a few days ago in the burial-ground of the Hackney Unitarian church, close to those of his former pastor and friend, and the last words of sorrow and respect were spoken over him by his friend, the present minister.